UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 01089068 9

Miss Levin -

With sincere thanks &
all good wishes

E. Einstein

15. XII 21.

THE CASE FOR CO-EDUCATION

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/caseforcoeducati00granuoft

THE CASE FOR CO-EDUCATION

BY

CECIL GRANT, M.A.

Sometime Scholar of Wadham College, Oxford
Headmaster of St George's School, Harpenden

AND

NORMAN HODGSON, B.A.

Sometime Scholar of Queen's College, Oxford

LONDON
GRANT RICHARDS LTD.
MDCCCCXIII

(1913)

LC
1601
G76

PRINTED BY THE RIVERSIDE PRESS LIMITED
EDINBURGH

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 9

CHAPTER

I. THE PUBLIC SCHOOL ITS OWN CRITIC . 29

II. ARNOLD AND THRING 55

III. THE HISTORICAL ARGUMENT . . . 78

IV. THE HISTORICAL ARGUMENT—*continued* . 101

V. THE WOMAN'S MOVEMENT 130

VI. THE EXPERIENCE OF AMERICA . . . 159

VII. THE EXPERIENCE OF AMERICA—*continued* . 184

VIII. THE BOY AND THE GIRL 201

IX. THE BOY AND THE GIRL—*continued* . . 238

X. MENTAL DIFFERENCES AND THEIR BEARING . 260

XI. POSITION AND PROSPECTS 295

APPENDIX A 312

APPENDIX B 313

APPENDIX C 318

INDEX 321

H. DRVMMONDO RAVVNSLEY
BONARVM FAVTORI CAVSARVM
SCHOLÆ S. GEORGII PRÆSIDI

"ἀλλ' ἐκτρέφεσθαι μὲν αὐτὰ ἐν πάσῃ ἐυσεβείᾳ, ὡς κοινὰ τέκνα τῆς ἀδελφότητος, ἀφωρίσθαι δὲ καὶ οἴκους καὶ δίαιταν τοῖς τε ἄρσεσι τῶν παίδων, καὶ ταῖς θηλείαις, ὡς μήτε παῤῥησίαν, μήτε θάρσος ἄμετρον πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους αὐτοῖς ἐγγίγνεσθαι."

S. Basilii, Opera II. 496 E. *et seq.*

"Et sane qui Sexum alterum ad studia idoneum negant, iam olim reiecti fuere ab omnibus philosophis."

Vossius de Nat. Art., L. II., C.2.

"Tho' I know not what to say of the scheme of educating boys and girls together, yet on the whole I think this the [best] chapter in the book, and many hints in it worth consideration."

W. E. GLADSTONE. *Pencil note on the chapter which advocates Co-education in "The Vindication of the Rights of Women." Reproduced by permission.*

INTRODUCTION

"Theurer Freund! Du hast das Gefühl dieses Zusammenlernens gehört und seinen Muth und seine Freude gesehen. Sage selbst, wie war Dir, als Du es sahest?—ich sah deine Thränen, und es wallte in meinem Busen die Wuth über den Menschen, der es noch aussprechen könnte: die Veredlung des Volks ist nur ein Traum. Nein, sie ist kein Traum."—PESTALOZZI.

WE are on the eve of greater changes in education than any which the world has yet seen. Change is indeed a word scarcely strong or decisive enough to describe what is about to take place. For the twentieth century is even now in labour with a New Thing. Scientific education is about to be born.

How great are the differences between what has been and what will be may be shown simply by a threefold division, dealing with (1) the aim, (2) the method, (3) the result.

I. THE AIM OF EDUCATION, PAST AND FUTURE

In the past there have been many aims; in the future there will be but one. In the past not only have different people aimed at producing different results in the same child, but one person has admitted many distinct aims. The parent, for example, has striven for health in consultation with the doctor, for intelligence with the aid of the teacher, for morality with the help

of the pastor. Even in these three supposed departments there have been manifold subdivisions. Each separate requirement has in fact raised a fresh question. How are we to avoid cold, to nourish the body, to prevent overwork, to teach gymnastics, French, mathematics, to inculcate truthfulness, to safeguard against immorality, to promote faith ? All these and a hundred more have been regarded as separate problems. Upon each separate treatises may be consulted, showing no consciousness in their writers that there is one answer which gives, and alone can give, the clue to all. It is as if, confronted with a despatch in cipher, we should attempt a different solution for each word contained in it.

Not only has education in the past embraced all these different aims, but, where attempts have been made to find a single definition of the aim of education, there has been nothing approaching to general agreement. How indeed should there be ? For, the art of education being hitherto wholly empirical, we have all laid special stress upon the matters to which we have attached most importance. To many the word education has connoted little more than the acquisition of knowledge ; others have thought of it solely as the development of brain-power ; a third school have cared mainly for physical fitness ; a fourth for moral security ; yet another for religious training. Definitions of the aim of education have consequently, like the recipes of a cookery-book, prescribed varying amounts of each ingredient, according to the taste and fancy of the writer. Nor has such a line of argument

seemed to be unreasonable or unconvincing. " What is the use of culture if a man cannot earn a livelihood ? Let each boy therefore learn a trade." " What is the use of wealth without health ? Let physical fitness therefore be the first aim." " What avails success in this world, if it is to be followed by retribution in the world to come ? Religion then is the one thing needful." As far as it goes, all this is valid enough reasoning. Nothing but the new knowledge could avail to prove its futility.

What then is the definition of the aim of education which the new knowledge gives us ? *To assist and not to thwart the natural development of the physical, mental and moral faculties, and of a will controlling them into conformity with God's will.*[1]

It will be objected that here are our ingredients once more, inviting us to quarrel as to the right proportion of each. But this is not so. For in the first place we know now that the full development of each faculty is essential to the development of the rest ; that the physical helps the mental and that both of these are necessary to the moral ; that upon the fulness of the moral depends in turn the successful education of body and mind. And in the next place we claim no longer the right of dictation, as a cook is absolute arbiter of ingredients and quantities, but know that, if we can give Nature her full

[1] So long as men persist in expressing their beliefs differently, these two words will be variously rendered Universal Will, Natural Law, the dictates of Humanity, etc. But the new knowledge will constrain us to adopt a single creed.

opportunity, she will prove a judge less fallible than ourselves.

II. The Method of the Past and of the Future

Little can be said of the methods of the past except that, like the aims, they have been many, diverse and wholly empirical. To the question, How are we to teach French ? the answers have been, " I find this way excellent," " And I this," " And I this other." Nor has the method, temporarily prevailing in the teaching of one subject, won acceptance from the teachers of the rest. So many subjects, so many methods. And between all these methods there has been but this one point in common, that all alike have failed. Nor is this surprising. *For there is no way of teaching French.* The story repeats itself in the past methods of physical and moral training. Every kind of experiment has been made. All have been greeted by their discoverers and by few or many others as the long-sought, perfect method ; and all alike have ended in disappointment. Still less in the search for methods than for aims has it occurred to the world of educators that no distinction need be made between physical, mental or moral ; that for all three, if indeed they be not themselves wholly one, one method only is required.

In the future then, one method. But it will not be a method of teaching. For it is as true of all else as of French that there is no way of teaching. Of the two verbs, to teach and to learn, the latter alone is vital.

The former has merely a shadowy right to existence as indicating the material which the learner employs. The teacher of the baby is a rattle, a bed-post, his own toes. The teachers of the grown man are books and things and men in action. Nor is it otherwise with the ages between infancy and manhood, save that the boy and girl for their learning make more use of the spoken question. Shall we then have no further use for teachers ? No use, if you press into the word its present significance ; but much use of those, call them what you will, whose concern it will be to provide the right material and the right environment for the child's learning.

The method of the future will be Observation—scientific observation with a single aim in view. This aim will be, of course, that which we have already defined. The " teacher " will set himself by observation to learn how to assist and to avoid thwarting the natural development of the physical, mental and moral faculties of the child ; and to encourage in him a will, controlling these faculties into conformity with God's will.

We may divide both the observation and the observers, though not without overlapping, into two kinds. For partly observation will be directed towards gaining a scientific knowledge of the general laws which determine child nature, and partly it will be observation of each individual child and his environment, discovering in what directions his natural development is in danger of being thwarted and what material will assist him in his self-development.

Similarly the observers will tend to be divided into two bodies, according as they seek by psychology, physiology and pedagogy, to extend our knowledge of how to observe child nature or, using the results of these enquirers, set themselves to educate particular children. Naturally the first body whom we may call educationists will be drawn largely from the ranks of the second, for whom we may retain the name of teachers; whilst the success of the teaching body (amongst whom we must include parents) will depend wholly upon the extent to which they are able really to grasp the principles and carry out the laws of scientific education.

But neither to educationists nor to teachers (including parents) will belong the place of first importance in conducting the education of the child. That position will be held, as in fact it has ever been, solely by Nature. Small as has been our recognition of her in the past, unimaginably many as have been the obstacles placed ignorantly in her way, yet Nature alone is responsible for whatever success men can claim to have been achieved in the education of their children. But let us not wrap things up in mystery and speak of the miracle performed by Nature, as though she had given us private information of it, the details of which we were forbidden to divulge. There is no mystery and no miracle beyond that which is common to the story of creation. Nature educates the kitten and the cub, the eaglet and the bee. It is all as wonderful as it can be; but there it is —a fact, the knowledge of which is common property.

When we use or (more commonly) abuse the term self-development, we mean in plain language that the God, or the Providence, or the Natural Law, which provides so wonderfully for the growth of a kitten into an efficient cat, does in fact provide (as we should expect) still more wonderfully for the growth of a manling into an efficient man. The machinery is all there—in every case. Just as every bee learns infallibly to perform its marvellous routine of duties with entire efficiency, so every child of man is provided with the necessary machinery, motive-power, instinct (there is no single term quite satisfactory) to become efficient in the art of manhood. In every case alike this power of efficient development has been, as we say (and it is a helpful, though imperfectly scientific explanation) evolved. We even know something, as we shall see a little later, of the means employed by Nature to bring about this result. What is really startling is that, whereas in all other created things the result of education is that each within its appointed limit becomes efficient, in the case of man alone the education of his children results in a vast majority of cases in inefficiency. Of this inefficiency we shall speak under our third head (the Results of Education); it remains to deal here with Nature's method and with the way in which the educational systems of the past have interfered with and thwarted it.

Nature's method with her animal creation, including man, is to provide innate faculties[1] and, in addition,

[1] Psychologists, please believe that the terms here used give the right meaning to the layman. They are not intended to arouse controversy.

the instinctive desire to practise and so to develop them. The kitten, scratching a tree-trunk, is practising certain exercises, resulting in muscular development. Infallibly the instinct is there, and, if Nature be not thwarted, unerringly she produces the required result. All failures are the history of the thwarting of Nature. In a sense she may be said not seldom to thwart herself. Thus a frost, a drought, an unkindly soil, the presence of enemies, all these natural phenomena may thwart Nature's educational ventures. But the prime interferer with Nature is man. He alone sets himself with intent to bend her to his purposes. He uses the faculties which she has given him to interfere with natural evolution. In the world of flowers, for instance, he has evolved in the course of a few years an amazing wealth of new varieties. What is tragic is that, whatever may have been the case in past eras, *in the matter of the education of his own children, he is now, and for long has been, interfering with disastrous effect.*

In all other educational experiments, in the education of roses and potatoes, of pigeons and of horses, man has sought—and not without success—to humour Nature, to turn her wisdom and power to his advantage; in educating the human child he has most strangely lost sight of the relentless operation of natural forces and, daring to cross and thwart Nature, daring to substitute his own empirical inventions, has succeeded, much to his own astonishment, in checking for a space of many hundred years the onward march of the mind and spirit of humanity.

The more harmful of these self-imposed checks to human development are becoming known to us through the scientific enquiries of Dr Montessori and others. It is not our business here to go through them in detail. Our business is to urge that no interference with Nature is at once so unreasonable, so harmful in its results, and—thank God—so capable of abolition as the separation of boys and girls in their school life.

III. The Results of Education, Past and Future

It is a thankless task to try to bring home to the consciousness of one's readers the extent of human failure. We should prefer that it might be "taken as read." But though the defects of humanity are the well-worn theme of countless essays, poems, sermons and romances (many of them illustrating themselves the decadence, which they deplore), few attempts have been made to catalogue the inefficiencies of mankind with a view to showing reason to believe them due to defective education and removable by a more scientific educational system. Nevertheless this is not the place in which to enter fully upon this dismal catalogue. We must content ourselves with appealing briefly to common experience. What we would assert is that, whereas our educational successes do not number more than (very roughly) ten per cent. of the population, and of these only too many are one-sided—*i.e.* mental but not physical or moral, and so on—there is no reason why, under a carefully scientific system, we should not rely upon Nature to succeed on all three sides with all her children.

Heart-rending as it is to contemplate the miserably low standard of the mass of the population, there is something perhaps still more pathetic in the failure of our successes. Whether we take the records of men distinguished in (what we absurdly call) their several spheres, and note how almost inevitably their great qualities have had to exist side by side with contemptible inefficiencies, or consider more impersonally how constantly great ability is wedded to weakness of body or lack of moral balance ; whether we consult history and biography, or draw upon our own experience, honesty must compel us to admit how desperately heavy is the price we have paid for omitting to see that development must be not one-sided, but three-sided, that to succeed intellectually but fail physically or morally, to succeed morally but fail in body, or in intellect, or in both, is not success, but failure.

But how few and far between are the cases which reach to even this qualified measure of success ! To how low a standard of attainment are we content to affix such great terms as " able " or even " godly " ! Above all, what a weary ocean of humanity remains, to which not the most complaisant could dare to apply the word success at all ! There are methods of self-deception, pleasant ways of blinding our eyes. We may brag of the power and possessions of a nation and so seek to forget the pitiful condition of the individuals, of whom its millions consist. We may use swelling words in describing the works of man, his cities, his factories, his inventions, his luxuries, hiding

from our memories the city slums, the artisan toiling in his great factory hour after hour, day after day, as year follows year, upon some miserable little act of mechanical repetition. We may talk of moral evil and physical disease, as though they were imposed upon us from without, rather than the natural consequences of our own obstinate violations of natural laws. Indeed, so long as we ignorantly supposed that our educational systems and methods were the best which man could be expected to devise, there was much excuse for such attempts, however obviously hypocritical, at self-satisfaction. For what cannot be cured must be endured. But the remedy is now within our reach. Long ago the intuitions of Pestalozzi and of Froebel might have put us on the track. Later in our own England a middle-aged bachelor turned aside from his very abstract system of philosophy to set down strikingly concrete instances of the blunders of mothers, nursemaids and teachers. But these reformers lacked authority. All the time our experts in the teaching profession were serenely reassuring us with the promise that just a little readjustment of the *curriculum*, improvement of desks or better payment of teachers would give us all that was required.

And now at last the fact stares us in the face, that our teachers are not experts after all ; that to learn what Nature intends for the child one must add to pedagogy, physiology and psychology and above all (what should be the foundation of all these sciences) observation of the child under *natural* conditions from

the cradle onwards. For the real expert is amongst us. Using the intuitions of the inspired teachers of the past, but using still more the recent advance of scientific knowledge gained for us by physicians and psychologists, Dr Montessori is offering us for the first time in the world's history a truly scientific method of learning how to educate our children.

The results ? They lie in the womb of the future ; though the promise of them is already visible for those who have eyes to see. Let us content ourselves with Pestalozzi's memorable anticipation and with two or three quotations from Dr Montessori herself :

" Mit einem Worte ich bin durch den Eindruck des Ganzen und durch die ununterbrochene Gleich-heit meiner Erfahrungen dahin gekommen ; den Glauben wieder in mir herzustellen, den ich im Anfange meiner pädagogischen Laufbahn mit so vieler Wärme in mir selbst nährte, aber im Fortgange unter der Last ihrer Zeitkunst und ihrer Zeithülfsmittel beynahe verlor— den Glauben an die Möglichkeit einer Veredlung des Menschengeschlechts." [1]

" . . . die Veredlung des Volks ist nur ein Traum. Nein, sie ist kein Traum ; ich will ihre Kunst in die Hand der Mutter werfen, in die Hand des Kindes und

[1] Pestalozzi, " Wie Gertrud ihre Kinder lehrt," p. 106 of the original edition: " In a word the impression derived from my whole experience together with the invariable similarity of result in each case has given back to me the belief with which I started out so confidently on my educational career but of which the burden of the time's lack of skill and resource nearly robbed me— belief in the possibility of the uplifting of the human race."

in die Hand der Unschuld, und der Bösewicht wird schweigen, und es nicht mehr aus-sprechen : sie ist ein Traum." [1]

"I believe, therefore, that in opening the house to the light of new truths and to the progress of civilisation we have solved the problem of being able to modify directly the environment of the new generation and have thus made it possible to apply in a practical way the fundamental principles of scientific pedagogy." [2]

"To me the triumph of discipline through the conquest of liberty and independence (for the child) offers the greatest hope for human redemption through education. Perhaps through the conquest of liberty of thought we are making our way towards a great religious triumph." [3]

It will not, we hope, be thought that such a contrast between the past and the future is irrelevant as an introduction to the case for Co-education. For it is upon the return to Nature, which will be the keynote of the coming reforms, that the case for Co-education essentially rests. Were it not for the strange neglect of the truth, that Nature is the one and only educator, it could never have entered into the mind of man to perpetrate so senseless a violation of her methods as

[1] Pestalozzi, "Wie Gertrud ihre Kinder lehrt," p. 17: "It is NO DREAM—the uplifting of the race. I will give the secret of the art of it to mother, to child, to innocence; and malice will be stilled and no longer able to say that it is a dream."

[2] "The Montessori Method," p. 64.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 372.

the separation of boys from girls. Once the need of a return to Nature is recognised, the cause of Co-education will be finally won. But belief in the desirability of reuniting boys and girls in their schools did not take its rise from the new knowledge, being rather an intuitive (and, if you like, empirical) anticipation of it in one direction and with one main object. It is by no means the desire of its advocates to wait until Co-education can be introduced as part of a general scheme of reform ; and in this volume the existing system of education is accepted on the whole as that in which Co-education must seek to find and justify its place. Yet it will be found to fit naturally and inevitably into all the changes, which the more far-sighted can already see to be necessary. That education must begin in the cradle and be continued without a break on one consistent plan throughout ; that ages must be mingled, as well as sexes ; that numbers must not be herded together beyond the power of one head to know intimately each individual, for whom he is responsible ; that class teaching will more and more tend to disappear when it is realised that an average (new style) boy or girl of twelve years of age can learn a language without other help than that of books ; that religion is a vital part of any educational system, the development of physical and mental faculties depending upon the due nourishment of the soul as well as of the body and the mind ; that Nature is greedy of " material " for her educational processes and cannot produce her best results in a desert or a monastery ; there is not one of these

truisms of the reformer which does not almost postulate Co-education.

The experiment at Keswick and (subsequently) St George's, Harpenden, upon the results of which, extending over fifteen years, are based the conclusions of the authors of this volume, was directly caused by the hope of finding a remedy for the moral evil in our schools. We believe that no one who has come into anything like intimate relation with the experiment doubts that the hope has been justified. By the way, many important advantages of Co-education, unsuspected at first, have declared themselves. The test has resulted in the addition of very many adherents to the cause and, so far as we know, of no single enemy. Others, who have made a similar experiment have the same tale to tell. From every country in which Co-education has been attempted come assertions of its success in minimising the moral difficulty. These assertions, *whether justified or not*, are at least a great matter. For they have never been disproved. If this be because no one has taken the trouble to do so, that is a serious indictment—not of the co-educators. It has to be said here that neither education authorities, of whatever kind, nor those who are concerned with the public morals, whether the Church or the great societies, or parents themselves, have done their duty in this matter. It is true that many local education authorities have opened schools for boys and girls. To do so without a most careful enquiry into and judgment upon the whole matter, including the special methods to be adopted and the

qualifications necessary for members of the staff, is to perform a signal disservice to the cause of Co-education. At the present time there is a feeling amongst the public that such schools are established from motives of economy. This, if true, is indeed lamentable ; if untrue, it is hardly less lamentable that so little should have been done to prove the statement groundless.

Meanwhile the headmasters and the more thoughtful house masters of the boys' Public Schools show not a little anxiety as to the difficulties of which they themselves are conscious and not a little interest in the claims of Co-education. It would be possible for us to quote a good many distinguished names in this connection, but, as there might be a danger of failing to give an entirely right impression as to the attitude of one or another to the matter, it seems better to content ourselves with a general expression of gratitude for the sympathy which they have displayed, and an assurance that we would not willingly give cause of offence, either by any opinion expressed in this volume or by the tone of its expression. We believe that far-reaching reforms are necessary and will come. But we sincerely trust that in the hour of change all that is good and great in the conduct and tradition of the Public Schools of England will be scrupulously maintained. We recognise that upon the supporters of Co-education is thrown the onus of proving that the many and great advantages which attach to these splendid foundations need not be sacrificed in a school to which girls are admitted ;

and, heartily as we desire the triumph of the cause which we have embraced, we would rather wait long for its complete success than witness such an indiscriminate attack upon existing institutions, as might endanger anything of that heritage which England owes to the grandeur of their traditions and the efforts of those who ably and devotedly serve them.

It would be disingenuous to hope to arouse no resentment by our treatment—however anxiously restrained—of the "moral" problem. But that is a risk which advocates of Co-education are compelled to take. It seems best therefore to explain at the outset, as clearly and as briefly as possible, our position with regard to this vital matter. Those who feel it to be a not unfair statement may be sure that, whether convinced or not, they will not find cause of offence in the following chapters.

It is known that from time to time a boys' school, or a house in a boys' school, becomes permeated with immorality. Most of us are acquainted with men, either long or but recently past school age, who declare that in their time it was practically impossible for a boy to pass through their school unscathed. We are of opinion that such a statement, though made in all good faith, may be in fact a gross exaggeration, but that, when all possible deductions have been made, it proves a state of things which no serious thinker can regard as other than desperately disquieting. On the other hand, we are for our part convinced that it is quite possible for a boys' school of limited numbers, or for a particular house in any

school, however large, to be practically free from immorality. But we hold that this immunity can only be *guaranteed* under very exceptional circumstances, including unusual powers of vigilance, penetration and influence on the part of headmaster, house masters and prefects, the utmost care in selecting boys for admission and the relentless use of expulsion or removal. The proportion which schools or houses, thus immune, bear to the rest may be partly judged by (*a*) the statements on one side or the other made by past pupils, (*b*) the estimate of morality in the upper classes formed by those, such as clergy, doctors, lawyers, who have some means of judging, (*c*) certain available statistics bearing upon national immorality. It is our opinion that no fair consideration of the evidence can lead to any other conclusion than that the existing system does not provide adequate moral security. We hold that neither parents, seeking to safeguard their own children, nor patriots, caring for the health and even the existence of the nation, can rest satisfied with things as they are, unless it should be proved beyond reasonable doubt that no amelioration is humanly possible. It was in search of a definitely practicable remedy that the experiment was instituted, of which this book is a result. We claim to have proved certain things : (1) That the presence of girls in a school produces an atmosphere as definitely unfavourable to immorality as fresh air is unfavourable to certain germs of disease ; (2) that, conducted on right lines, using such other safeguards as all good schools should

employ, Co-education can render any school as securely immune from immorality as good boys' schools are immune from small-pox or from epidemics of stealing; (3) that this immunity extends to such approaches to immorality as the use of coarse language or tolerance of gross stories; (4) that this immunity does not require the sacrifice of any of those advantages which belong to the best schools for the separate education of boys and girls; (5) that on the contrary Co-education proves to possess many advantages over and above its freedom from moral evil; (6) that Co-education is no chance remedy, unrelated to other necessary reforms, but is on the true line of advance, which is leading us through scientific methods to a better understanding of the child and of the development of his faculties in accordance with the natural laws of his being.

CHAPTER I

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL ITS OWN CRITIC

"To speak and behave like a gentleman, to be obliging and courteous, and neither censorious, hypocritical, nor conceited is a standard which the majority of public schoolboys reach, and it is worth a great deal, if only as an introduction to the world. But it is compatible with a low standard of public and private duty, an untrained intellect and a dislike to mental effort and moral responsibility."—*Edinburgh Review*, April 1897: "Old Eton and Modern Public Schools."

DISCUSSION on the subject of the Public School often welters in a confusion of cross purposes. The issues are obscured by ignorant criticism and unbending partisanship. Between these two extremes the *Edinburgh* reviewer from whom we quote strikes, as it seems to us, the happy mean—what time he also hits the nail on the head. Some things, he avers, the Public School inevitably does for the boy; other things—are they less important?—it may chance to do or to leave undone. They may or may not be a frequent, but they are not a necessary result. Whether they are a result at all or not, would seem to depend enormously on the boy himself. If, being an average boy, he aspire, not necessarily to intellectual distinction, but to intelligent interest in the things

of the intellect, there are those on the staff who will help him ; there is also, with equal certainty, among his peers a spirit of intransigeance which will raise against him a rock of offence. Should he hanker for moral responsibility, he may find an excellent field for the exercise of his powers both of self-control and of government in the office and authority of a prefect. But he will realise that the ethical code of a boy among boys is apt to shape itself to a curiously twisted mould. By force of personality he may and often does rise above the surrounding limitations. But his success is in many ways despite rather than by virtue of the institution which is fashioning his destinies.

It is difficult to discuss these things without falling under suspicion of undue bias. But if we confine ourselves to an examination not of the criticism which comes from without, but of the account of the system which is given from within, and given often by way of answer to external attack, we may legitimately consider ourselves entitled to base an argument on information thus acquired.

The most vigorous, we might almost say the most pugilistic, defence of the Public School System which has come under our notice, is the work of the grave and judicious Mr Pellatt.[1] The book in question fairly

[1] T. Pellatt, "Public Schools and Public Opinion," 1904. Mr Pellatt's experience then included private tutoring, four years as an assistant master at a great Public School, some time as an assistant master of a lesser Public School, and over ten years as the headmaster of a preparatory school. He accordingly writes, not as some other scribes, but with authority.

bubbles with righteous indignation. Criticism shrivels before the white heat of its burning scorn ; the tongue of detraction is utterly withered. It is the part of the valiant to direct his defence to the most stricken quarter of the field. Mr Pellatt, therefore, is mainly concerned with the intellectual side of Public School life, the very existence of which heretical people have been found to doubt. It is not, however, our purpose to join issue with him here ; although, when we hear another distinguished Public School master say of the Public School that " intellect is left to take care of itself," [1] we may be permitted to suspect some need for defence. What interest us most are : first, the author's views as to certain characteristics common to most Public School boys, and, secondly, his treatment of the all-important moral question. And we may be allowed parenthetically to thank Mr Pellatt for introducing the latter point in a work the main thesis of which did not of necessity demand it. The problem is central and vital ; but it is far too commonly ignored or too lightly dismissed. We cannot refrain here from referring to a most flagrant instance of this way of darkening counsel. A few years ago there appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine* [2] two articles on " The Choice of a Public School," expressly addressed to parents, and dealing fairly generally with the main problems of school life. Absolutely the only reference in those articles to the most difficult of all the problems of boy life is the statement that it is to the

[1] A. C. Benson in " The Schoolmaster."
[2] December 1904 and January 1905.

personal interest of a house master carefully to look after his boys, with the accompanying conclusion that he may therefore be safely left to do so!

The most obvious fact about the English Public School System is one which applies to Continental systems as well. A certain number of boys, often a very large number, are herded together and live a corporate life. The characteristic which distinguishes our system from the others is the large measure of freedom which is allowed to this juvenile society. From this freedom the chief virtues of a Public School training are commonly supposed to spring. Mr Pellatt, with laudable honesty, thinks the readiness of the critics to swallow this theory without demur, a trifle hasty. It is absurd, he says, to suppose that "you have only got to herd together anything between five hundred and a thousand boys at just the age when passion is more likely to eclipse reason than at any other period," to ensure a constant output of angels. He puts in a powerful plea for the staff, which we should be the last to question, as the perennial source of moral virtue. In spite of this, he does not, of course, deny that freedom has certain definite advantages which are claimed for it. And we are wholly in agreement with him where he calls it "the essential condition of the formation of character," and where he says that without it "you cannot develop that sense of individual responsibility which we in England value above all other things." The point of interest for us lies in his view that independence under these conditions brings

losses as well as gains—losses, moreover, which are inevitable and can only be regarded as necessary evils. To the question, "Can you get a high intellectual standard amongst boys under free conditions?" he answers explicitly, "Under free conditions you cannot get this standard with *all* boys." This he is constrained to admit is a "glaring defect from the point of view of coherence and uniformity," but is consoled by the thought that the schools on whose beauty it is a blemish are still vastly superior to the barrack-like establishments of France and Germany. And so they are.

Upon a further diagnosis of the disease, he finds it to be largely due to a certain artificiality in the attitude of boys (*a*) to their masters, (*b*) to their work. In his natural annoyance at this naughty spirit, he searches for culprits; whom he finds in (*a*) home influence, (*b*) literature. These he rounds upon, and administers to them a most merciless drubbing. A boy, he says, is encouraged, both by the books he is given to read and the conversation he hears, to jeer at his masters and to despise his work. He is thus confirmed in his use of a false scale of values. Granting a good deal of truth in this view, and admitting that parents, and authors too, could, if they would, do much to correct a false perspective, we are still impelled to ask whether it is really the home which creates the ideals of the school, or whether it is not much more probable that the conditions of school life are themselves responsible both for artificiality in the outlook of the boy, and unseasonable

levity on the part of the parent, who after all was himself a Public School boy only a generation ago? The question is worth some consideration.

It is obvious that the moral standards of a society are set and determined by the character of its members. If the character of a person, for whatever reason, is limited in certain definite directions, you will not necessarily get rid of the limitations by associating him with other persons similarly limited. You are rather in a fair way to enhance the limitations. Something of this kind is a dominant factor, although it is not, of course, the only factor in Public School life. The defects of boy morality are not criminal, but non-moral, because they are due not to perversion, but to immaturity. They used to be considered as evidence of original sin; a wider knowledge enables us now to recognise in them an inevitable manifestation of the law of growth. The difficulty lies here: that persons living together unconsciously surround themselves with an atmosphere of corporate life, which reacts upon them as individuals; and the morality of this corporate life, as we remarked above, is defined by the limitations of those who share in it. Now in any free society the social life makes demands on the members which cannot properly be satisfied without the exercise of a full and mature morality. In no society of course is this ideal made actual. And when the society is composed of boys the ideal, owing to their very immaturity, is beyond their compass.[1] Morality grows through experience, and will not be

[1] None the less must the ideal be held before them.

found full-grown at any point during the process. Mr Pellatt's insistence on the moral function of the staff in a Public School is a recognition of this limitation. And the function is one which all acknowledge as necessary and important. But insistence on it does not solve the social problem of boy life. In a sense, of course, the staff join in the corporate life of the school—but in a limited sense. There is, there must be, a corporate life of boys apart from the staff ; and moral influence, to be thoroughly efficacious, must proceed from within. That is one of the principles upon which the co-educational solution is based. But we anticipate.

Let us consider more in detail the nature and origin of the limitations in question. Boyhood, of course, is a period of physical as well as of mental growth ; and to the boy himself it is the former circumstance which is the more prominent. This fact of physical growth has a determining influence on the boy's sense of values. It gives him a keen appreciation of what one may term the muscular virtues—bodily skill and courage, and, psychologically connected with these, self-assertiveness and power to dominate others. Martial instincts will lead everywhere to a martial code ; and the keen sense of personal honour and dignity which marks the soldierly character is found also in the schoolboy. There are interesting points of analogy in this regard between the practice of schoolboys and the manners of ancient chivalry, albeit the latter were softened and refined by influences which play no part in the life of the Public

School. Undoubtedly there are many merits in this ethical code. Although it is largely, it is not entirely self-regarding ; it makes the boy as ready to recognise the admired qualities in others as to cultivate them in himself. The qualities themselves in their proper measure are essential to full virility, and have a necessary part in the complete character of a man. The danger is that when the virile aspect of life is in any case predominant, it may be allowed to permeate the awakening moral consciousness to the exclusion of other aspects ; and that too at a time when physical development itself troubles the calm waters of a boy's soul by the introduction of an element—that of sex—the significance and influence of which differ so widely from the interests and impulses which have hitherto absorbed him.

The deficiencies in the content of the schoolboy's morality may be traced directly to his absorption in the development of one side of his nature. The sense of corporate life, with its incitement both to co-operation and competition, enhances his devotion to the ideals he shares with his peers. Rules of conduct are unconsciously formulated and quickly become conventional ; for, since they have but little basis in reflection, arising, as they do, rather in response to half-conscious impulses than in fulfilment of reasoned desires, they on that very account find acceptance the more readily on a basis of common consent as an easy substitute for individual certainty. Once established, the standards of conduct become stereotyped in a rigid mould, hard to alter

from within, harder still even to touch from without.

A main characteristic of this modern "scholastic philosophy" is an indifference to spheres of life which seem to offer no scope for the attainment of its particular ideals; with the unhappy result, for example, that the period of intellectual expansion synchronises with the prevalence of a tendency distinctly hostile to it. That is a real difficulty which must be expected to occur in boy life under any conditions; but its occurrence in the home—or, we must add, in the co-educational school—is not made worse by the presence of the special circumstances which we have suggested as arising inevitably in the corporate life of a monastic boys' school. We think that Mr Pellatt's transference of the blame for this fault to the home is hopelessly inadequate as an explanation and altogether unphilosophic as a theory.

It is, however, in the more specifically moral sphere that the operation of the schoolboy's code is most effective and most harmful. Full morality demands for its apprehension and exercise an intellect touched with emotion; and conduct depends more on delicacy of feeling than on mental grasp. In the course of nature and in a right environment this refinement of perception and feeling should accompany the change of boyhood into manhood. But there is no doubt that the demands of a code of morals, which arises in relation to the purely physical and muscular side of development and relegates emotion to a low

plane,[1] are injurious to the growth of the more delicate sense. We do not wish to dwell on the narrow conceptions of truth and honour beyond the circle of recognised obligation, which—we do not say are always found but—are certainly not incompatible with a strict maintenance of the accepted code. But we must draw attention to one grievous deficiency which is manifestly due to the causes under consideration. The inconsistency between the strictness of schoolboy honour when concerned with aspects of conduct which hold a high place in its scheme of life, and the laxity which is allowed in reference to the morality of sex, is notorious. This does not mean that every boy in a Public School necessarily has lax ideas on the subject of sex. But it does mean that the cultivation of a high standard on this question must find other sanction than that of the code which governs the greater part of the boy's conduct—a separation involving initial handicap at a point where handicaps can be least afforded. And it means, further, that in actual result and practice there is a great deal of moral evil in schools.

To some the chain of reasoning which has brought us to these conclusions may appear flimsy and theoretical. But the reasoning, by which we have tried to explain the conclusions, is not the evidence upon which the conclusions themselves are based. For that we are content to go to original sources. In any case it is time we returned to Mr Pellatt.

[1] Emotion, of course, finds its vent nevertheless; and often in most undesirable ways.

In the passage where our author deals with the moral question, the righteous indignation, of which we spoke, reaches, as it were, its climax. Let us lend an ear to him. Of all types of argument private conviction is the least assailable, and we must quote without further comment Mr Pellatt's "intense and abiding conviction, which grows stronger as time goes on, that Public Schools, as a whole, are pure and healthy places, and *that moral dangers are far less there than they would be if boys always lived at home.*" Before this statement we are, we say, dumb. But in view of it we think it is a poor look-out for the homes of England when we hear Mr Pellatt observe further: "If this freedom be allowed—and without it the *raison d'être* of the whole system disappears—there will always be a certain amount of evil and impurity in a Public School, and the healthiness or unhealthiness of the system as a whole must obviously depend upon the extent of it." With regard to the minority who admittedly do suffer, he suggests that their peculiar liability to "infection" is due to "heredity or other inscrutable causes." Reasoning analogically; one may presume that it is useless to pull down consumption-breeding slums, because undoubtedly those who succumb are such as are "peculiarly liable to infection from heredity or other inscrutable causes." Mr Pellatt says statistics are difficult to obtain. We agree. We have no wish for them. He follows on with a curious passage, touching "the uncorroborated evidence of those who, having left their Public School; love to indulge in that propensity for scandal which

distinguishes a type of Englishman, whom all who have a grain of chivalry or honour in their character must hold in utter hatred and contempt. The man, whose love of cheap sensation causes him to sacrifice the honour of his old school to any whom he can persuade to listen to his nauseating prattle, belongs to that class whom barristers and lawyers know so well, and whose testimony is never accepted in a witness-box till it has been subjected to the severest tests that the ingenuity of cross-examination can apply. . . . The natures of such as these, like many of the poisonous growths of the vegetable world, can only flourish in an atmosphere of putrescence. . . . The man, who wags his head and delights, with all the secret gusto of the true Pharisee, to discourse about ' what went on ' at school in his day, condemns himself. How did he find out ' what went on ' ? "

On these startling observations we should like to make several comments. In the first place, Mr Pellatt seems to us not merely to be extremely violent, but even to verge upon irrelevance. The reference to law reminds us somehow of an old adage which suggests that, when your case is not so good as it might be, you should abuse somebody. Again, does it really help your advocacy to destroy the character of a witness, but in so doing implicitly to substantiate his evidence? To hint that the witness participated in the crime hardly proves that the crime was not committed. To some minds it strongly suggests quite an opposite conclusion. And in this connection it is not of much consequence whether the culprit be the

witness or some other. And, if there be a question of honour, does not "what went on" touch that far more nearly than any amount of telling about it afterwards? We certainly think so, and we think, too, that many who "tell about" these things afterwards are much more concerned for the honour of their school than Mr Pellatt would appear to allow.

But we do not wish to rest our case on a single author or the experience of a single schoolmaster; especially as there is a considerable degree of unanimity on the question immediately at issue. Mr A. C. Benson is a lucid as well as a prolific writer; and the change from reading Mr Pellatt to reading him is, as it were—with due respect to both of them—the change from thick soup to clear. He says precisely what he means and may therefore be taken at his word. We extract two quotations from his widely read work, "The Schoolmaster"; the first emphasises the inconsistencies of the schoolboy's code, and the second expresses the extent of Mr Benson's optimism as to the abolition of prevalent evils which result from that code:

"If schoolmasters could do anything to alter the strange code which exists almost instinctively among boys, so merciless to sins against honour, so heedless of sins against morality, and to cultivate social indignation against offences against purity, the battle would be nearly won."

"And I say confidently that I look forward to a

time, not necessarily very far distant, when the evil may be so far diminished as to become simply abnormal. That is all that can be hoped for, and that I dare to hope."

We called this optimism, but it is optimism of a somewhat pessimistic type.

An interesting contrast to Mr Pellatt's view of home influences is that of Sir Arthur Hort of Harrow School, who writes thus :

" It being admitted that (ideally speaking, at least) in the period of adolescence, the influence of parents, of sisters, and of home generally, is of paramount importance, it would on the face of it seem perverse to remove a boy for two-thirds of the year from this natural society, and to place him in an artificial community, where the presence of custom may tend to make him a ' unit ' rather than an ' individual,' and where he may have to face, at an immature and susceptible age, moral temptations from which his home might have shielded him till his character was formed." [1]

It is true that the writer agrees with Mr Pellatt in thinking the risks justified on the whole by the supposition that the advantages of the Public School are not otherwise attainable. But he shows more evident appreciation both of the gravity of the risk and of the kind of influence which, could it be introduced, would counteract it.

[1] " The Public School from Within."

The headmaster of Eton, in his valuable book, "The Training of the Young in the Laws of Sex," seems to advance a step farther. For he writes : " Some of the temptations of school life, *especially those due to the separation of the sexes*, are such as to test the weak points in any boy's armour."

The italics are ours, and may be taken as evidence of our gratitude for an interesting and fruitful suggestion from a decidedly authoritative quarter. We would not be anything but deferential to the headmaster of so great a school, but we must confess ourselves at a loss to understand how Mr Lyttelton, after making that statement, can still maintain, as he does with some emphasis throughout his book, that school life is not the origin of immorality among boys. While it is no doubt true that few duties are so scandalously neglected as the duty of parents to instruct their children in the laws of sex, the fact of this omission, though it may double the danger, does nothing to diminish the reality of the risk which Mr Lyttelton himself recognises as in any case inherent in the monastic character of the Public School. And if, as Mr Lyttelton says, " there has been nothing whatever in their (*i.e.* boys') bringing up to counteract the claims of self, or to make them understand the woman's side of the question at all," we think the crime of " the separation of the sexes " in school is, on his own showing, made tenfold worse. But we are not aware that he defends it.

We must proceed to further quotations, although we fear the burden of them may grow monotonous.

That, however, is in the nature of cumulative evidence.

It is in our recollection that a few years ago Dean Welldon, who has had considerable experience of Public Schools, set rolling a snowball of newspaper correspondence with a letter strongly adverse to Co-education.[1] It is therefore with more than usual interest that we find him using his pen to this effect:

"It must not be forgotten that the life of boys in a public school is to some extent artificial in its character: they are separated from the influences of home; they lose, for a great part of the year, the society of their mothers and sisters, with its softening and ameliorative power; they live almost exclusively with other boys whose life is controlled and guarded like their own. Many of the evils which arise in a school are due to its character of artificiality. *The remedy, then, for these evils will be in restoring the life of boys, as far as possible, to its natural conditions.*"[2]

Once more we plead guilty to the italics, and would defend them on the same grounds as before. The Dean, we must admit, does not proceed to argue the case for Co-education. He appeals for opportunities for the natural exercise of religion. We are wholly with him; and only go beyond him—if at all—in including morality under that head. In regard to morality, Dean Welldon is as optimistic as Mr

[1] *Daily Graphic*, September 1907.

[2] "Thirteen Essays in Education by Members of the XIII." 1891.

Benson—with a similar qualification. He writes elsewhere :

"Where a healthy confidential relation exists between a master and his leading boys, he need not fear the prevalence—I do not mean he can feel safe against the occasional existence—of the most dangerous moral evils in a school." [1]

At the time of writing three articles have just appeared in a weekly journal, from the pen of a distinguished old boy of one of the greatest of our Public Schools, on the education, intellectual, religious and moral, which he there received. The criticism is decidedly hostile and in some respects obviously exaggerated. Present masters of the school have in reply dealt fully with the exaggerations, especially those of the first two articles. We should like to cite both the criticism and the answer under the third head. The writer says :

"There is plenty of religion and purity and high-thinking . . . there are fine qualities among the boys, unsurpassable anywhere. Yet the lowness of the moral standard is, for all that, in one respect deplorable. For, while no external force is ever used to lead a boy into vice, there is, generally speaking, no sort of public feeling amongst the boys against vice in itself. On the one side, no boy ever suffers . . . because of his virtue ; on the other, no boy who prefers vice loses anything whatever in public estimation on that

[1] *Nineteenth Century*, September 1906, p. 406.

account. I have known boys high in the school—athletes and even scholars—whose lives were simply deplorable . . . yet they were cheered as heartily, on public occasions, and reverenced as adoringly as young Sir Galahads."

The answer to that last sentence is :

"Vicious boys are not really, you know, 'reverenced as young Sir Galahads.'"

That is hardly the lie direct. The question is whether such boys suffer a definite fall in public estimation. Again, if we may take it as proved by previous quotations that the atmosphere of the Public School does actually encourage evil in certain directions, what are we to make of the following reply ?

"A public school, like a day school, does 'throw the responsibility upon the parents.' Who else should be responsible ? The school does what it can with chapel services, prayers and kindly intercourse. . . . The master, as even our critic admits, 'strains every nerve to combat' vice. You might think it 'impossible,' as the bishop said to St Augustine's mother, 'that the son of these tears should perish.' And after many years of experience, I honestly think that an enormous majority pass from childhood to manhood unscathed. Of course there is the 'nightmare' of the (critic's) master, the anxiety from his elders that attends every child, *whether at home or at school,* on his progress through the physical development that

distinguishes child from man. Some fail, and we have good warrant for trying to help the hundredth, but the novelist and the well-known journal are apt to forget the ninety and nine. We who work do not. We know the help boys give to one another towards leading a decent life."

If this percentage were approximately correct, we should have thought a more explicit and downright denial of the allegations quoted above would have been possible and easy. On the relative importance or unimportance of the mathematical aspect of the whole question we shall have more to say in the next chapter.[1]

We have already referred to two articles in *Blackwood's Magazine* which were noticeable for their omissions. Four years after the publication of those articles, there appeared a third,[2] remedying (not confessedly of course !) the omissions. The pill was rather slow in following the jam—a curious sequence in any case. Not even those whose views are described as "hide-bound" would accuse *Blackwood's* of Radicalism; and suggestions as to a need for change, which emanate from so pronouncedly conservative a quarter, must be listened to with respectful attention. The article in question is ominously entitled "The Dead Bones." We extract one.

"He (*i.e.* the Public School boy) finds that the road

[1] See pp. 75-76.
[2] *Blackwood's Magazine*, December 1908.

to honour lies through play ; he works at his play and plays at his work. He finds that a deal of immoral behaviour, both of speech and action, lies beneath the surface of school life ; and being, as I have said, no hero, is to some extent influenced thereby. Things which first shock, then attract, and he goes through a certain moral crisis ; mercifully ended for him by a good prefect, who, against all the rules, beats original sin out of him with a fives bat. He decides that although certain sins are pleasant, the percentage of risk attaching to them is too high to make indulgence safe. Moreover he is confirmed about this time, and the straight talks in chapel from a sensible and kindly headmaster are not without their effect."

Yes, but supposing he does *not* meet with a good prefect addicted to unorthodox uses of the fives bat ? That instrument may be very effective, but is scarcely strong enough to serve as a peg on which to hang a scheme of salvation. Moreover, the Hedonism in the case is worthy the Epicurean sty.

We must allow that the Bishop of Hereford does not, on the whole, indulge quite so deeply in conservatism as *Blackwood's Magazine*. But he has, in his long years of service, seen and known the best traditions of the English Public School ; and has been closely associated with important developments of it. And on the question before us the Bishop has expressed himself thus :

" The boarding school life is not a natural life for

the young, because, to begin with, it means the taking away of the child from all the natural influences of home, from the presence and daily contact with the father, and especially with the mother. So I think in discussing questions of this kind we should concentrate a good deal of attention on the duty of lessening barrack life for the young, and I consider it desirable parents should, wherever possible, take pains to keep their children, and especially young children, within the sphere and purview of their own personal life." [1]

Dr Percival's own solution of the difficulty is, as is well known, the combination of school and home influences in the day school. To the question as between boarding and day school we shall recur at a later stage [2]; we only cite Dr Percival here as one more witness to the dangers of boarding schools as they at present are.

Dr Gray, late Warden of Bradfield, who as a member of the Mosely Commission to America in 1903 reported convincingly in favour of a co-educational system, wrote that "The semi-monastic system under which boys, at the most critical stage of their life, are forcibly separated for nine months in the year, not only from the refining influence of mother and sister (as is the case in English boarding schools), but also from free and easy intercourse with girls of their own age, has very serious and obvious drawbacks." [3]

[1] "Proceedings of the Public Morals Conference," 1910, p. 30.
[2] See Appendix C.
[3] "Mosely Commission Report," p. 165.

Mr Paton of Manchester Grammar School in a study, which recognises to the full the merits of the Public School, yet concludes : " For, when all is said and done, the English Public School is not according to nature, it is not a normal development." [1]

Finally Dr Clement Dukes, perhaps our greatest authority on school hygiene (and its connection with morals), writes thus on the subject of moral perversion: "Drastic school measures, such as dismissing the offender, have never been successful in the eradication of the evil, and the only sure method for stamping it out consists in the elevation of the tone of the whole school. . . . The boy has been the victim of an unnatural system of education." [2]

We cannot more fitly conclude this string of excerpts than by a raid on the columns of *The Times*, a newspaper which always contrives to suggest that its words convey the united wisdom of heaven and earth. In a leading article, dealing expressly with Co-education, the Great Anonymous points out that American experience of that system is based on day schools, and proceeds :

" But the boarding school system is deeply ingrained in English educational traditions ; and no one familiar with that system can ignore the prevalence of evils which are the constant dread of the most earnest public schoolmasters, and are liable to affect from time to time the best and greatest schools.

[1] " English Public Schools."
[2] " Health at School," p. 139.

The Co-educationalist says, 'Bring boys and girls together, and the chance of such evils will be lessened' (we say more than that). This, however, has yet to be proved and only experience can prove it." [1]

In most of the extracts we have given, and indeed in the written or spoken opinion of thoughtful Public School men in general, there is adequate recognition of the direct and immediate harmfulness to the persons concerned of perverted morality in schools. But there is a certain disposition—also manifest in some of the extracts—to limit the view to these immediate effects. To trace indirect results in a general treatment of the question is admittedly a somewhat unsafe procedure. But there are one or two things which we think must be perfectly obvious upon a moment's consideration. There is much talk of those who come "unscathed" through their schooldays. But when, for instance, we hear the headmaster of Eton talking of the tone of young men towards outcast women as "hard and brutally callous or frivolous, with a kind of coarse frivolity not exhibited in relation to any other form of human suffering," [2] we wonder how many of the men in question (there is apparently no particularising) came "unscathed" through their youth, within the meaning of those who use the term. Experience certainly suggests that

[1] *Times Educational Supplement*, 2nd February 1911. Leading article.

[2] As quoted by the late Canon Barnett in a striking sermon preached at Westminster Abbey on 17th November 1912.

the tone is not confined to those who " fell " while at school, or even to those who have " fallen " in after days. If we may reason on the point *a priori*, it is not in the nature of things probable that a conception of the opposite sex, which is largely theoretical, being based on ignorance far more than on knowledge, should turn out to be either a right or a high conception. There is not the slightest doubt that the attitude, which is described in such deservedly strong language by Mr Lyttelton, is a common attitude among young men of the upper and middle classes, who may be otherwise quite excellent and respectable persons. If that attitude be considered exceptional —which we think it is not—let us describe another common attitude which usually precedes and may even accompany this one. We mean the attitude which in part considers a girl as a natural plaything, and in part surrounds her with a halo of fictitious romance,[1] thus creating an ideal, the unreality of which is but a poor guarantee of its permanence. Is not this a view which may be and generally is held by quite " moral " Public School boys ? Is it not just the kind of view to be expected under the circumstances? And is it not nevertheless a most pernicious, wrong-headed, and likely to be altogether fatal kind of view ?

[1] *Cf.* " Autobiography of Leigh Hunt " (who entered Christ's Hospital in 1792), Chapter III. : " Miss Field, an agreeable-looking girl, was one of the goddesses of the school ; as far above us as if she had lived on Olympus. Another was Miss Patrick, daughter of the lamp manufacturer in Newgate Street. . . . We used to identify them with the picture of Venus in Tooke's ' Pantheon.' "

It is a sad and a strange paradox ; but such are the ways of the world that the angel in petticoats of a boy's visions stands in far closer relationship to the poor outcast of the streets than we dream in our much philosophy.

And we have as yet touched only one side of the question—what we may call the positive side. Let us imagine that we had banished all the evil and the misery and the ruin and degradation which result from these things ; there still remains the loss a boy incurs in his development through his deprivation of the refining and spiritualising influence of the feminine sex. Society loses incalculably in the event. Girls lose as well as boys, women as well as men. Of these less seen but very real injuries we shall, however, have more to say at a later stage. Let us conclude this chapter with one more quotation from a great Public School man. In a striking passage Canon Skrine has given words to his hope that the cause of Co-education may prove not a destruction, but a fulfilment of old traditions.[1]

" Two thoughts are brought to me as I stand in the presence of your society of a school. . . . Let me try to name the former. It is that your cause, which is the education of English boys and girls, not in separation but together, can claim history as a warrant for its venture—can claim to be not a break

[1] Sermon preached on Speech Day, 1912, in St George's School Chapel. See *The Georgian*, vol. vii., p. 46.

with the past, but a development of the past, a standing upon ancient ways, and a going forward on them. . . . The school and the family, old opposites, counter-ideals, were beginning to find their reconciliation when it was discovered that a boy who lived at home as well as at school could be as fully a Public School man as his mate who lived all his hours at school only. But another movement was now converging. There were coming forward new makers of school, women this time. And what they made was a school for girls which in spirit and partly in material arrangement of the life was a Public Boarding School, but now not to train manhood but womanhood. You here and in other places, which are sister foundations to yours, are attempting a great further step in the same direction. What Dr Percival's Clifton did, was, as I understood it, to bring the Public School to the doors of the home, but of necessity only for the boy who lived in a home there. And what the new schools for girlhood have been doing has been to bring what hitherto had been home life, the life of girls, into the circle of the Public School. What you are doing, again as I am able to understand it, is to bring the home not only *to* the doors, but *within* the doors of the Public School. For where English youths are reared and disciplined and instructed, brothers and sisters together side by side, there surely the family has entered and taken a place of power within the school."

CHAPTER II

ARNOLD AND THRING

"The silent pressure of his ideal lasts much longer and reshapes the world much more than the actualities by which he attempted to suggest it. What perishes is the letter, which he thought so practical. What endures is the spirit, which he felt to be unattainable and even unutterable. It is exactly his schemes that are not fulfilled, it is exactly his vision that is fulfilled."—SAMUEL BUTLER, "The Authoress of the Odyssey," p. 226.

THE Public School system of England is, we are often told, the pride of England and the envy of the world. In the eyes of foreigners and not less in our own, it stands for qualities which have made us great among the nations. It teaches self-mastery and withal the art of governing others. It is the home of independence and a nurse of strong wills. If it inculcates, as is sometimes alleged, a certain superciliousness of tone, this is but the price paid for an abiding loyalty to aims and ideals which are none too common beyond the charmed circle; for a sense of kinship with great traditions, which despises the "lesser breeds without the law."

> "Coetusque vulgares et udam
> Spernit humum fugiente penna."

It moulds the character of those who fill the great professions and guide the counsels or carry on the

work of Church and State ; of those, too, who in all parts of the world are at once the rulers and the servants of the Empire. If captious critics have at times complained, as indeed they have, that the *curriculum* of the Public School is not adapted to modern needs, the answer is still generally given in the spirit of Squire Brown, whose thoughts on sending Tom to Rugby are thus described : " I don't care a straw for Greek particles or the digamma, no more does his mother. What is he sent to school for ? Well, partly because he wanted to go. If he'll only turn out a brave, helpful, truth-telling Englishman, and a gentleman, and a Christian, that's all I want." That the formation of character is what parents are mainly concerned about is perhaps even truer to-day than it was then ; and no less true is it that the English system provides a better training-ground for character than that of any other nation. But those who still utter these sentiments doubtless have in their minds, along with a vision of the Public School system as it is, some vague idea that, as it is, so has it always been. Waterloo was won long ere it was fought, on the playing fields of Eton. No doubt the storming of the Heights of Abraham was similarly anticipated. But it is ill jesting on a sacred subject. And indeed one may readily concede that a certain quality of hardihood has always characterised the English Public School. This quality, for all we know, may date from the Norman Conquest. But is the system as we know it really so very old ? How much of what is called the Public School spirit is the accumulated

inheritance of past ages, and how much is of more recent growth ? It is not seldom that the ivy on old walls is of earlier date than the spirit within them.

The product itself may elude our attempts at definition ; but the causes which go to produce it are fairly well known. The features which distinguish the English Public School from the schools of the Continent are, roughly, three : the large measure of independence which is allowed to the boys ; connected with that, the system of self-government through prefects, and lastly, the institution of organised games. Added to these there is of course a strong sense of corporate life and inherited tradition, the maintenance of which is rendered easier by the fact that the great schools are primarily boarding establishments. But organised games, as we know them, as a school of discipline and of self-control, are by no means coeval with William the Conqueror. A writer in *The Quarterly Review* for October 1857 [1] tells us of Rugby that " the only former playground (*i.e.* before the time of Arnold) of the well-flogged boys was the churchyard." Organised games were established by Dr Arnold who " never forgot the cheerless condition dragged through during his time in commoners at Winchester, and now happily changed. There, cribbed and cabined in a small court, the boys, like caged eaglets, beat their breasts at the prison bars, and could not get out, except on rare holidays, to exercise and play, to life and liberty." The *Quarterly* reviewer

[1] Article, " Tom Brown's Schooldays : Rugby Reminiscences."

is loud in his praises of " the noble pursuits of cricket-ball and football," and their influence on character.[1] But the manner of his praising certainly suggests that he is countering opposition from some quarter or other. And it is quite possible that the reaction from the militarism of the Napoleonic era was not favourable to the extension of Public School games, at a time when the whole system came in for a good deal of criticism. However this may be, there were other reforms introduced by Arnold—reforms which are now accepted as though they were a part of an immemorial tradition—which certainly aroused violent hostility, and must accordingly be admitted to contain elements of novelty. Arnold did not invent the Public School system. He accepted it, but with a fuller recognition than his predecessors of its potentialities both for good and for evil. For the good in it as it stands he may be considered perhaps to have traced the lines of all future development. Its tendencies to evil he strove against all his life, but with a consciousness that in one central point he had not succeeded, and a growing doubt whether indeed permanent success were possible, without further radical change.

The system of self-government through members of

[1] We cannot refrain from one quotation: " . . . in these hard contested matches will be found by no means the worst competitive examinations for those of our gallant youth who, from a more favoured development of body than of brain, will and must take to the profession of arms. Many a fine fellow who would fail lamentably in extracting a cube-root, will, in after life, face an enemy's square, and break it effectually."

the Sixth Form was not indeed originated by Arnold. It was found in some measure at Rugby and elsewhere.[1] But assuredly it was Arnold who made it an integral part of the constitution of a Public School and inspired it with the moral efficacy which has since belonged to it. There seems little doubt that, had it not been for Arnold, this distinguishing feature of English school government would have dropped out altogether. For we are told: "It was a point moreover on which the spirit of the age set strongly and increasingly against him, on which there was a general tendency to yield to the popular outcry, and on which the clamour that at one time assailed him, was ready to fasten as a subject where all parties could concur in their condemnation." [2]

But it is not our purpose to describe in detail the part played by Arnold in the making of the Public School. The point we wish to illustrate is that the Public School is no finished product of age-long evolution, but in some of its most characteristic features the work mainly of one man. Like most English institutions, its growth for centuries was haphazard. Arnold in less than a generation wrought

[1] That pre-Arnoldian prefects were not always all they should have been is suggested by the following quotation from Leigh Hunt, who entered Christ's Hospital in 1792. "There was a monitor or 'big boy' in office, who had a trick of entertaining himself by pelting lesser boys' heads with a hard ball. He used to throw it at this boy and that; make the *throwee* bring it back to him; and then send a rap with it on his cerebellum, as he was going off." —"Autobiography of Leigh Hunt," Chapter III.

[2] Stanley's "Life of Arnold," Chapter III.

order out of chaos.[1] The question which now arises is whether the advance made by Arnold was the last stage of a journey as well as the first ; or whether it is possible and desirable for us to develop still further the altered system we have inherited from him, and to do that in his own spirit, destroying the evil but preserving the good we find.

There is no question that Arnold left the Public School system even in its weakest points stronger than he found it. It is hardly necessary to cite evidence showing the low morality which prevailed in schools when Arnold went to Rugby. The thing was a crying scandal. That his influence raised the moral tone of schools throughout the land is undoubted. And since his day there has been further advance. Thring at Uppingham, and others elsewhere, spent a great part of their energies in combating the evils of low morality in schools, and to-day the standard, fluctuating though it still is, is perhaps higher than it has ever been. But the history of Arnold's opinions on this question is very instructive.

[1] *Cf.* Stanley's "Life of Arnold," Chapter III. Extract from a letter of Bishop Moberly, then headmaster of Winchester: "A most singular and striking change has come upon our Public Schools—a change too great for any person to appreciate adequately, who has not known them in both these times. This change is undoubtedly part of a general improvement of our generation in respect of piety and reverence, but I am sure that to Dr Arnold's personal earnest simplicity of purpose, strength of character, power of influence, and piety, which none who ever came near him could mistake or question, the carrying of this improvement into our schools is mainly attributable. He was the first."

Placed as he was in a position where sound knowledge of human nature is essential to even a small measure of success, and gifted with an unusual degree of insight into character and the forces which go to make it, he appreciated to the full the power there is in an institution. With all his sense of the opportunities open to those who administer a system, he recognised that the administrator is bound by the limitations of the system. With regard to the Public School system "sometimes he would be led to doubt whether it were really compatible with the highest principles of education; sometimes he would seem to have an earnest and almost impatient desire to free himself from it." He gives the impression of trying to be optimistic without being very sure of the grounds of his optimism. "Another system," he said, "may be better in itself, but I am placed in this system, and am bound to try what I can make of it." The difficulties he felt in the carrying out of his task were the more formidable in that they were, as he conceived, rooted in the system, being indeed the defects of its qualities. The very freedom which was the best feature of the system was, he felt, considering the natural propensities of boys when left alone, itself a bar to the maintenance of a high standard in certain points of personal morality. He writes of "the extremely low principles of conduct which are natural to a society of boys left wholly to form their own standards of right and wrong." He tells a friend that he never sees two boys at school in close converse without dreading lest the devil make a third.

On his prefectorial system, with its delegation of responsibility and authority to older boys who should transmit "through their example and influence right principles of conduct," he relied in great part to check the evil results of liberty in an immature society. But it is clear that, for all his confidence in this his favourite principle, he felt that for this evil there was no certain remedy from within. So strong was this feeling in him that he was already convinced when he began his career that only by the ruthless expulsion or "removal" of undesirable characters could he effect any good at all. And he carried his conviction into practice, despite much opposition. So powerless did he consider the system to deal with the bad influence of individuals that he wrote, "I know not how to proceed, or how to hinder the school becoming a place of education for evil rather than for good, except by getting rid of such persons." He was even moved to make a more astounding statement still. "Till a man learns that the first, second and third duty of a schoolmaster is to get rid of unpromising subjects, a great Public School will never be what it might be and what it ought to be." That statement should be taken as a measure, not of Arnold's capacity to deal with "unpromising subjects," but rather of his conviction that the Public School system contained no natural antidote to the evils itself generated. The final and most complete expression of this conviction is given in the last address he gave in Rugby Chapel, where the note of pessimism is audible indeed:

" I have never wished to speak with exaggeration ; it seems to me as unwise as it is wrong to do so. I think that what holds true of each of us as individuals, holds true of us also as a body—namely, that it is quite right to observe what is hopeful in ourselves, as well as what is threatening ; that general confessions of unmixed evil are deceiving and hardening rather than arousing ; that our evil never looks really so dark as when we contrast it with anything which there may be in us of good. I am very thankful for a great deal of good which I see or fully believe to exist among us ; I have no reason to think that it is become less in any way, in proportion to the evil amongst us, than it was in times past ; I believe, on the contrary, that it is greater—speaking only, of course, of the time within my own experience. But still what is very startling is this : that not only do we find, still as formerly, painful cases of individual badness recurring from time to time, which we might less wonder at ; but that there are still existing certain influences for evil in our society itself of the same sort as formerly ; so that there is something amongst us not unfavourable to the growth of individual evil, but rather in some degree encouraging to it. It is this which you can understand to be very painful. If out of the greatest number of persons who come to us every year there were a certain proportion bad it would be no more than what we might ascribe to the common condition of human nature ; and the evil which was brought here would be one

for which we could not be responsible. But we cannot flatter ourselves that this is so : we cannot pretend that our evil is all of it brought to us from without, that our fault is no more than that we have failed to correct it. Some undoubtedly grows and is fostered here, and it happens sometimes that they who came without it have here contracted it. And this continuing, I do not at all say increasing, but still continuing to exist among us, cannot but fill the mind with many painful thoughts, with anxieties, with doubts, and with difficulties, such as it were of little use to dwell upon any further now. Thus much, however, of the point which especially causes anxiety, I may and ought perhaps to notice. It is that our good seems to want a principle of stability, to depend so much upon individuals. When everything in past years has been most promising, I have seen a great change suddenly produced after a single vacation ; and what we might have hoped had been the real improvement of the school, was proved to have been no more than the present effect produced by a number of individuals. And thus, whenever things have been going on fairly amongst us, I have a natural dread of the change which may follow the end of a half-year, and which may show, as before, that the influences of the place in itself are not such as we could wish them to be. And if these alternations are for ever to continue; one asks what good can be ascribed to the system itself ; for there seems to be no sure improvement in it, but that it is at the best a passive thing,

presenting a good aspect when the individuals who belong to it happen to be good, but being in itself without any power to make them good or to keep them so."

It may be said that Arnold held too low an opinion of boy nature; that it was impossible for him to take into account the effect upon Public Schools of a progressive improvement in the morals of the nation as a whole, such as may be supposed to have taken place since his day—albeit a more profound view of education would expect the schools of a nation to lead in this matter rather than to follow. If our Public Schools at the present day could altogether give the lie to Arnold's pessimism; if their defenders could point not merely to an improvement, however well sustained in particular times and places, but to such a radical change in the propensities of boy nature under the peculiar conditions of monastic school life, as would foreshadow in the near or distant future a final uprooting of the evil, then one might be constrained to admit some force in the contentions thus urged. But we see no sufficient ground for such cheery optimism. We think that Arnold was as justified in his opinion of the limitations as in his view of the possibilities of the Public School system. And the chief ground for our conclusion is, as we have attempted to show, the admissions of those who, since they are at present responsible for the working of that system, are at once most concerned and most willing to defend it. If this be the case, it may be

bluntly asked, why did not Arnold introduce girls into Rugby, since that is the force of your proposition? Had he been able to do so judiciously, the history of English education might have been very different. But progress, in this country at any rate, rarely takes two jumps at a time; and it may be better so. Arnold was revolutionary enough for the English public of his day, and had enough to do to make such advance as was allowed to him. It is not likely that he ever contemplated the possibility of Co-education. None the less the principle of Co-education may prove the logical completion of his theories, and, added to what he effected, may realise his vision of the ideal school.

It is no disparagement of Arnold to say that he left some things undone. Fourteen years are after all but a short time in which to have accomplished all that undeniably stands to his credit. Quite apart from this question of Co-education, there are fundamental principles of education, which others than he discovered and carried into practice. So is it always with reformers. Edward Thring, although he did not come into direct contact with Arnold, began his work when the influence of Arnold had already passed into the Public School system, and was thus enabled to start from higher vantage ground and make fresh conquests in the cause of true education. Like all great headmasters, Thring was a philosopher as well as a pedagogue. In his view of life from the standpoint of a great thinker there are two points of especial interest for our present argument—two

principles, one of which it was his great work to carry into educational practice, and to impress on the schoolmasters of his own and every succeeding generation; the other, while he gave it equal prominence in his writings and speeches, he failed to associate in any very definite way with his scholastic reforms, but bequeathed to us of a later day to apply in a fashion which never entered into his dreams.[1] The first principle is as old as Christianity, and has been neglected in schools for an even longer period. It is simply the vital importance of the individual in the eye of the schoolmaster, as well as (and because) in the eyes of God. His letters abound in expressions of his conviction on this point, and his whole practice in teaching was one long exemplification of it. Consider this sentence from one of his letters: "A good teacher, with fair play and time, *ought to rejoice in a stupid boy.*"[2] And again, " . . . the central principle on which all my work has gone here is the *wickedness* of turning boys out of a school on any opinion of master, head or other, and the duty of training each boy and teaching him, however intractable he may be. It is the one thing I have lived for."[3] It was in order to impress upon his boys this same principle that he insisted on a somewhat rigid standard of social responsibility. "What Thring did of his own (*i.e.* as distinct from the work of Arnold) was to make not the Sixth

[1] And, we must allow, might have given him a nightmare, if it had!
[2] "Life and Letters," Chapter VII. Letter to C. W. S. Hyde.
[3] *Ibid.*, Chapter IV. Letter to a master.

Form responsible for the society, but the whole society responsible for itself. If anything went wrong, the first question was, 'Who was there?'"[1] In this way he emphasised the value of personality from the other side and taught his boys that rights find their correlatives in duties. To the moralists—to those who talk about morality—all this may smack of the commonplace. But it is a principle the neglect of which has obscured the magnitude of many evils which have afflicted schools in times past; and it is a principle very far indeed from meeting with due observance even at the present day.

It has been shown in the introductory chapter how much further this great principle of the value of the individual is destined to take us in the education of the future. It is a principle which, once stated, carries instant conviction, yet acceptance of it makes difficult of defence a system whose successes, though they be reckoned in phenomenal percentages, are always marred by the inevitable five or ten per cent. of failures. Thring objected strongly, much more strongly than Arnold, to the method of expulsion; for him, with his principles, it meant perhaps a confession of failure in a more real sense than for the other. Yet he too was driven on occasion to use it, when battling with the old serpent of moral evil among his boys. Perhaps the five per cent. had a better chance under Thring than even under Arnold, but the "lack of any sure principle" was in the system, and not in the men who worked it; and each

[1] "A Memory of Edward Thring," J. H. Skrine, p. 35.

in his turn, though he bestrode his little world like a Colossus, had to reckon with the old difficulty, and to come out of the struggle not altogether victor. Our debt to them is great indeed, and can surely best be repaid by a vigorous endeavour to tackle anew the problem they left for solution.

It is in the second of Thring's principles that we may, if we please, find a clue to the problem—in his profound belief in the power and beauty of ideal womanhood. Thring was something of a mystic as well as an intensely practical man, and in the hold which this belief had over his heart and his imagination we may catch a glimpse of the mystical side of his nature. It is ever the mark of mysticism that it is elusive, inarticulate, baffling expression ; and this incommunicable quality of his deepest thoughts partly explains the limitations of Thring's influence on the world of experts in education. Those to whom codes and schedules are their meat and drink are not unnaturally a little mystified by statements such as these : " The crowning fact of revelation to me is the revelation of the Bride—all mankind gathered up into the perfect excellence of *womanly* glory to be presented to the Bridegroom. What men ought to think of women is fixed for evermore by this divine intimation that the highest excellence is in character *womanly*." [1] Or again : " Think of men and women . . . as partners and joint workers in a kingdom of

[1] " Report of Church Congress at Carlisle, 1884," paper on Social Purity, p. 368.

life . . . where mankind are all gathered up into the glorious ideal of the Bride." [1]

Thring's own relations with women show him true to the highest tenets of his creed. Nothing could be more beautiful than his idealisation of Mrs Ewing, the worth of whose marvellous child stories he was among the first to recognise ; whose work and life inspired him to be, as he himself said, " a champion of women." His ideals, moreover, found their issues in his public action, although he did not, as it seems to us, work out his creed in practice to its logical conclusion. He held a high opinion of the importance of women's education, at a time when the pioneers of the movement were still struggling for a mere place in the sun. His standpoint indeed was not simply that of a believer in " women's rights." Education for him was a single problem, and he was more concerned with what he believed women could do for education, than with what education could do for women. When he gave what was (on the part of schoolmasters at least) the first public recognition of the movement, by inviting the Headmistresses' Conference to assemble at Uppingham in 1887, he noted in his diary : " If the world is to get better education, the women must do it." [2] We are further told : " That the first decade of the child life of all mankind age after age passes continuously through

[1] " Report of Church Congress at Carlisle, 1884," paper on Social Purity, p. 372.

[2] " Life and Letters," Chapter V. Extract from Diary, 14th May 1885.

the hands of woman seemed to him one of the most significant facts in the whole range of human affairs."[1] In his address to the conference he said that their work was " truer and better than anything we masters could set on foot. Both because the rough instrumental work of the world is done by men, whilst the fine and delicate life-power, with its influence on life, is done by the women ; and also because you are fresh, and enthusiastic, and comparatively untrammelled, whilst we are weighed down by tradition, cast, like iron, in the rigid moulds of the past, with still heavier chains of modern improvement imposed by present law on our life. The hope of teaching lies in you." And, more significantly still : " Woman was created to help—to make good, that is, the deficiencies of the world of men . . . it is the divine mission of women to throw a halo of gentler life round this hard, warring, daily contest of good and evil, struggling and toiling in their pain."

It is perhaps not fanciful to connect with his "sense of the superiority, we will not say of the passive, but of the non-militant excellencies " [2] his belief in the importance of beautifying the surroundings of a boy's life at school. It is evident too that he felt a need to remedy in some way the special deficiencies of a monastic establishment. " The house," he wrote, " must be a home, with a home feeling about it, and home arrangements." A school conducted on these lines would make possible a full application of that

[1] " Life and Letters," Chapter X.
[2] " A Memory of Edward Thring," J. H. Skrine, p. 252.

principle of trust which he, in common with Arnold, held to be the only true basis of school administration. On the specific question of moral evil in schools and the way to deal with it, Thring held, as it were, a middle course. On the one hand, he seems to have mistrusted the strength of a fugitive and cloistered virtue, for he held it better that a boy should meet and face his temptations for the first time at school, than afterwards in the larger world. On the other hand, he was emphatically hostile even to the mildest interpretation of the wild oats theory. He says quite definitely in the address at Carlisle, from which we have already quoted : " Boys at school also should be protected, by all their surroundings being framed, unknown to them, so as to shut off temptation." [1] No amount of the best kind of talk, he felt, was likely to be adequate in itself ; but a great deal could be done by the provision of the right kind of atmosphere. " Alter the conditions, or be silent."

It is true that Thring was optimistic on this subject, especially in the earlier years of his experience at Uppingham ; and it is true that his school was freer than most others from the evil. But he admitted that the conditions of Public School life tended to concentrate the evil, and he did not believe, any more than Arnold, that the system of itself contained a natural antidote to the poison. To one reading his biography it occurs sometimes as almost strange that he does not appear to have contemplated the possibility of educating boys and girls under the same roof, or of

[1] " Report of Church Congress, 1884," p. 370.

introducing mistresses on to his staff.[1] His biographer in one place brings him curiously near to the point: "Finally he dwelt upon the necessity of school life having joined to it a home life. The purifying influence of good women, and a fuller recognition of woman's work and place in the world he looked upon as that which promised most for lifting mankind into a higher atmosphere of pure life." He further quotes a striking passage from the Diary written after Thring's return from the Congress at Carlisle: "I do not think God's plan of creation by which woman was created as a help in life-work has ever been fairly tried, and I have a boundless belief in womanhood and the power of good women for purifying the world." The school is not, of course, the world. But what the world is very much depends on what the school is; and it is difficult indeed to conceive how the raising and purifying of sex relationship in the world, which Thring contemplated as a distant ideal, should ever reach attainment unaided by the agency of the school.

Arnold and Thring had this in common: that they looked upon the problems of school life with eyes which were open to a larger view. There is an absurd proverb about a cobbler sticking to his last. The cobbler's acquiescence in this suggestion has made him proverbial in another way, as the most opinionated and obstinate of men. In the Republic of Plato metaphysics, psychology, ethics, logic and education are all jumbled together. But one rarely meets with

[1] No doubt the difficulty of obtaining an adequate supply of competent women was greater at that time than it is now.

an educational text-book which in essentials is more than a middling commentary on Plato's Philosophy of Education. It is the same breadth of view in the two great English schoolmasters which leads us to claim them as more for us than against us. The schoolmaster has to deal with tough material in more directions than one ; and the impress of a man's career on the system he works or suffers under, is hardly to be taken as the full measure of his aspirations and ideals. Some may think that this attempt to build an argument for Co-education out of the work of Arnold and Thring is an instance of the profitless task of brick-making without straw. But there are straws. And if the straw be inadequate for the making of bricks it may still serve—if one may burden so light a thing with the weight of a second metaphor—to show the setting of the wind.

We have travelled far in a hundred years. And when so short a time sees so many changes in an immemorial institution, with few to deny that the new order is better than the old, may we not ask those who profess still to stand upon the ancient ways, whether indeed the whirligig of time has left them much to stand upon ? Is it not clear that the Public School is still in process of evolution, and has shown a capacity to change with changing needs, and enlarged views of the function and possibilities of education ? The idea that education is not a thing to be left to chance, but a great trust given into the hands of a nation, injurious if neglected, but powerful for good when consciously used for the furtherance

of high ideals, may be old in the history of thought, but is certainly not threadbare through any assiduity of application. Criticism, no doubt, is destructive, but it is also selective. And in a world of constant change and, we hope, amelioration, constant criticism of institutions, based on wise principles of selection and combination, is essential to advance. Educational systems are not in themselves particularly sensitive to impression from the movements of the outer world. They seem somehow to stand in a backwater of public life. If that is not universally or at present true, it certainly represents the case of the English Public School in the past.

What then of our criticism ? It may be said that we take narrow views ; that our vision is distorted ; our sense of proportion vitiated by concentration on a single point, and one in regard to which our judgment may be called in question. It is true that the particular moral problem on which we have dwelt does not of itself comprise the entire content of morality, or touch at every point the whole duty of man. And we are far from denying that in a large percentage of cases the danger to which we allude is absent. It would be more correct, however, to say that the catastrophe is absent, for the danger is there all the time. But the moral problem is *the* moral problem in boy life, and in the matter of percentages, though we were to grant you the ninety and nine (and the facts will hardly allow us to be so generous), there remains the one. And there is this further to be considered. Just as the most terrible thing about a high rate of

infantile mortality is not the deaths which are recorded but the inevitable deterioration among survivors in like conditions, which is beyond calculation, but represents a wastage even greater than the other, so in the case under review results not wholly dissimilar are found. If we ask the question, not, "How many boys are morally ruined by the Public School system?" but, "How many boys are morally harmed?"—what answer shall we get? Or if we go further and ask: "How many boys leave school with a positive, not a negative ideal of purity, and a determination not merely to keep themselves aloof from contamination, but also, so far as in them lies, to see to the stamping out of the evil?"—again, what answer shall we get? It is no answer to say that schools have nothing to do with this matter. It is at least a matter for citizens; and schools are the training-ground of citizenship. If a nation is suffering from a great evil—and we are dealing with an evil from which no nation at present is free—it is not those only who are directly involved who merit censure. They also are to blame who only stand and do nothing.

But even if it were proved against us that we exaggerate the positive harm which the system with all its merits does to many of those who pass through it, we should still remain convinced that from the standpoint of ideal education it exhibits grave deficiencies. We submit that it is not in the nature of things that a system which, having regard to the natural constitution of human society, is so extremely artificial as this is, should provide an ideal preparation

for life. Quite apart from the obvious folly of enhancing by unnatural conditions the dangers of adolescent boyhood, there are, as we shall attempt in a later chapter to show, other ways in which the practice of separating the sexes is highly detrimental to the full development of both.

Whether the change we suggest would involve such an alteration in the constitution and working of the Public School system as would destroy its traditional and undisputed merits is admittedly a question for discussion. But it would be a diabolical handicap on human progress if the good and evil of an institution proved so indisseverably bound together, that the only remedy for the latter should destroy also the former. And we think that experience has already given the lie to the suggestion. At least we may disclaim any intention to lay bricks where we find marble. Like the builders of Christian Rome, who occupied the sites of ancient temples, and beautified their churches with pillars chiselled in honour of old pagan gods, we too would be wise in our generation and leave the stones unturned wherever possible.

CHAPTER III

THE HISTORICAL ARGUMENT

"The family, as being most directly founded upon natural relations, has always been regarded as the indispensable basis of society, and often as the root from which this has grown; and its constitution has always furnished the model to be imitated by all social order."—LOTZE, "Microcosmos," Book VIII., Chapter V., § 1.

THERE is no disputing that to those who go about to defend a cause an appeal to experience is a valuable ally. Nor indeed is the appeal made without reason. The natural conservatism of the average man represents an instinct which itself finds its justification in experience. As Burke said: "People will not look forward to posterity who never look backward to their ancestors." And a reference to the verdicts of history is often the best weapon wherewith to silence the advocate of change.

The opponent of Co-education confesses to an insuperable respect for such verdicts. His reading of them is unhesitating, his presentation comprehensive and dogmatic. Professor Stanley Hall tells us that Co-education "violates a custom so universal that it seems to express a fundamental instinct. In all ages of history, and in all stages of civilisation, from

savagery up, in the Orient, in ancient Greece and Rome, and, with few exceptions, in modern Europe, the dawn of puberty is marked by segregation of the sexes, especially for every purpose that can be called educational." [1] We must admit that to prove a wide acceptance of the co-educational principle in past times would tax the dialectical powers even of a party politician. Fortunately there is no need for us to embark on so hazardous an undertaking. Perhaps we take a different view of the necessities of the case. If you wish to prove, for example, the advisability of granting votes to women, you may find much in history to support you, though the Oxyrhyncus Papyri be dumb upon the question, and no whisper of the suffragette be heard throughout the Middle Age. History after all is not a record of orderly mechanical development, and there is nothing syllogistic about progress. History indeed is illogical in the extreme—a record of men dimly groping after half-realised truths, and as often as not belying their principles by their practice. The prophet, catching a glimpse of the ideal, transcribes his vision in winged words ; the people are impressed, but pigeon-hole the document for future reference. Nearly seventy generations have, each in turn, educated their successors since Plato wrote his " Republic." Yet we think that M. Jacques Dalcroze invented Eurhythmics. We require a Montessori to demonstrate to us the futility of pot-hooks ; but many centuries ago St Jerome was

[1] Address to the American Academy of Medicine, Boston, 4th June 1906.

writing thus to a lady about the education of her little daughter: "Put into the hands of Paula letters in wood or in ivory, and teach her the names of them. She will thus learn while playing." We may admit that the case for Co-education does not rest upon garnered experience of the system in past ages. It still remains true that the "historical" argument for Co-education is by no means the weakest.

There are certain truths about the relation of the sexes—truths regarding the real meaning and value of the home and home life, the extent to which the position of woman in society determines her power for good, the connection between sexual and general morality—which emerge gradually in the course of history and even yet are by no means come to fruition. The truth about these things has never gathered force and concentration enough to exert a determining influence on the character of educational institutions, but it has thrust itself sufficiently to the front to affect profoundly the general constitution of society, and has probably contributed more than any other factor to the moral evolution of the race. The position of women in the scheme of society at any time is a not unfair index of the state of civilisation in certain essential aspects. A low ideal of womanhood reflects and in turn fosters a low standard of sexual morality; and the dependence of general on sexual morals is a lesson writ large in the history of individuals and of nations.

Despite certain traces of matriarchal systems in ancient times, one may state generally that the

"subjection of women" goes back to a very early date. A natural result of man's struggle with nature was to give to physical force a prominence out of proportion to its real value in the scale of human worth. And we suspect that this incidental consequence of the conditions of primitive life has had far more to do with the almost "universal" segregation of the sexes in education than any such instinctive aversion to the opposite course as that imagined by Professor Stanley Hall. In the practical education of the jungle the divergence between masculine and feminine *curricula* must have been so pronounced that Co-education can hardly have arisen as a subject for discussion in barbaric debates. But even the heathen in his blindness did not herd his boys and girls in monastic institutions. The age of the satchel and the ferrule was indeed not yet. The schools were inaugurated by the priests. And here we come upon a force which more perhaps than any other has throughout the ages stifled the possibility of Co-education. The administration of religion has practically always been monopolised by men. The earliest schools were conducted by priests for priests; and the primitive maiden willy-nilly had to stay at home. The absence of Co-education in early times —and (as we hope to show) in later times too— may be accounted for by causes quite unrelated to the merits of the question itself, and certainly irrelevant to the position of to-day. There are two factors at least which operate in the direction of segregation from the beginnings of civilisation

—the subjection of women and the influence of ecclesiasticism.

The existence of these obstacles is more than incidental. It is the indication of a failure to solve satisfactorily the problem of sex relationship—a failure which is not yet reversed. In no period of history has the position of women in society more than remotely approached what we can all recognise to be the ideal. The moral difficulties which surround the problem have been enhanced by the exigencies, real or supposed, of economic and social organisation ; and the increasing complexity of modern civilisation makes it more imperative than ever that we should attack the problem with conscious effort, instead of drifting, as heretofore, with the stream of haphazard events. Even if the obstacles thus created had been absent, there is a further impediment in the fact that the theory of education itself has only evolved through slow and tortuous processes. We talk glibly of education as a full and harmonious development of the faculties, as a preparation for life from every point of view, but we find the theory easier than the practice. The theory itself was never completely realised even by the most far-seeing of early thinkers, while the application of what was realised was hampered even at the most favourable times by the imperfections of the social system.

With us it is a commonplace on paper at least that the moral aim in education is the most important. But it has certainly not always been so in theory ; still less in practice. Among early nations the first

apparently to lay stress on the moral aim, and the importance of education for the individual as distinct from the tribe, was the Hebrew. And it is interesting to note that with the Hebrews woman attained to a higher social position than in other and older civilisations of the East. The Hebrew family was not simply a unit of social organisation ; it was also a school of morals,[1] and the obligations of family life formed an important part of the ethical code. " Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." Until the return from exile the family indeed was the only school. We are fond of attributing the vigorous and healthy quality of English manhood to the English Public School. These Children of Israel were a stay-at-home folk. Are we then so much better than they, or are we so sure that our national ideals will stand the test of thousands of years, as theirs have done ? In the schools which were established after the return the priestly element naturally predominated. The synagogue itself began rather as a place of religious instruction than of worship, and when the system of education which was initiated in the second century before Christ was completed in the first century after, the connection was strengthened and continued. Education

[1] " Only on the supposition that many of these homes were the nurseries of pure sentiments and lofty ambitions, can we account for the fact that the Hebrews did not utterly succumb to the immoral practices and tendencies of the time."—" Social Life of the Hebrews," Day, p. 135.

was wholly religious.[1] Whether girls actually attended the primary schools is uncertain ; and their share in the higher education must have been small, since that was directed to the advanced study of the law. It is uncertain too what part was taken by women in school instruction. But what is quite clear is that the family was regarded as the source of moral instruction and that the establishment of schools was not intended to diminish the responsibility of parents. The character of school education was such that no special provision was made for girls ; their training was left to the home as the natural agent, with the direction that they were to be trained especially to become good mothers and capable of directing the moral welfare of their own children in after life.[2] That home ideals were not forgotten in schools is shown by the somewhat drastic provision, " that no unmarried man or woman should be allowed to undertake the duties of teacher." [3]

It is doubtless to their tenacity to the ideal of family life, more than to any other circumstance, that the Jews owe the maintenance of that high standard of individual purity and social solidarity which even

[1] " The School System of the Talmud," B. Spiers, p. 19. " (The Hebrew child) from the sixth to the tenth year was instructed in the Bible only, so that he became thoroughly versed in the Scriptures. From the tenth to the fifteenth he was instructed in the Mishna, and from that age upwards in the Gemarah (religious writings)."

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 8, 54.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

in the conditions of modern slum life still attracts the admiration of the investigator.[1]

The theocratic creed of the Hebrew gave him a strongly individualistic bias in human affairs. To the Greek "πάντων μέτρον ἄνθρωπος," and he was therefore by nature a citizen. For, though the gods were remote from him, the city at least was a living and present reality, and claimed his devotion. If he was a Spartan, his conception of the civic ideal was negative rather than positive—strength to resist the enemy, both within and without the gates, with some indifference as to the kind of life in which the city was to be made secure. But, when his country was Athens, he at once found in citizenship a full realisation of individual culture and morality and in so doing elevated his own ideal of civic life. Yet if the Greek ideal in general was high, it was also narrow. Greek culture rested upon a basis of slavery. The Greek solved the economic problem for one-tenth of his population by ignoring the claims of nine-tenths. His dilettante religion deprived him of that conception of the value of personality with which a deeper faith in greater measure endowed the Hebrew. His loss here being only emphasised by the

[1] *Cf.* "The Jews of East London" (in "Problems of Modern History"), Beatrice Webb: "Moreover the moral precepts of Judaism are centred in the perfection of family life, in obedience towards parents, in self-devotion for children, in the chastity of the girl, in the support and protection of the wife. The poorest Jew cherishes as sacred the maternity of the woman, and seldom degrades her to the position of a worker upon whose exertions he depends for subsistence."

narrowness of his political ideals, and the subordination of family to State, there was little chance that he would reach that ideal of womanhood and family life which distinguished the practice of at least the contemporary Roman, and gave to the latter a firmer basis on which to erect a lasting civilisation. There were no homes in Greece,[1] and the ideal of Athenian womanhood was the negation of any ideal, "not to be spoken of either for praise or for blame among men."[2] The absence of any real home life meant that even the domestic ideal was lowered to little better than a servile status.[3] There was little hope of permanence in a civilisation which only allowed intellectual eminence in a woman at the

[1] "Schools of Hellas," K. Freeman, p. 282: "There were no home influences in Hellas. The menfolk lived out of doors. . . . When (the young Athenian) came home, there was no home life. His father was hardly ever in the house. His mother was a nonentity living in the women's apartments; he probably saw little of her. He learned to dissociate himself from his family and associate himself with his fellow-citizens. No doubt he lost much by this system, but the solidarity of the State gained." Did it? Contrast his Majesty King George V.: "The foundations of national glory are set in the homes of the people, and they will only remain unshaken while the family life of our nation is strong, simple, and pure."

[2] Thuc. ii. 45. There is a curious parallel to this sentiment in an essay on Taste, written by a sister of Sir Joshua Reynolds: "The love of praise in a female breast should never transcend the domestic sphere; perhaps the most perfect feminine mind habitually aims at nothing higher than an exemption from blame" (quoted) in "Sidelights on the Georgian Period," George Paston).

[3] *Cf.* Xen. Econ., iii. 12 and vii. 5 *et seq.*

cost of personal honour. Aspasia is the most pathetic figure in Greek history.

The Greek view of life was reflected in Greek education. At Sparta girls were certainly educated, and very much in the same manner as boys ; the sexes sometimes united in choral dances and hymns in honour of the gods. But Spartan civilisation had little of permanent value to hand on to posterity. At Athens girls were neglected except in regard to quite rudimentary instruction, and Athenian writers show that on this point theorists and practical men were in accord.[1] Plato's co-educational proposals [2] need no more than a passing notice, being based on a perverse conception of sex relationship, which looked rather to the elimination than to the mutual enrichment of sex differences.

No one can dispute the contribution of Hellas and Hellenic life to civilisation. But the meteoric quality of that short-lived brilliance argues essential defects. And among the forces, which in past ages have worked for the fashioning of the modern world, there are others beside the Greek spirit to which we are indebted for gifts which make up the real wealth of nations. No doubt there were other causes than a low ideal of womanhood which helped in the ruin of Greece. But in the Greek view of life there is

[1] *Cf.* Xen. Econ., iii 12 and vii. 5 *et seq.*

[2] "Republic," v. But perhaps Plato was not even a Co-educationist in our sense. Indeed, in "The Laws" (749 D) he explicitly advocates the separation of the sexes after the sixth year. He was a sort of County Councillor with a *penchant* for "dual" schools.

no greater deficiency than this. And when some explanation is needed to show why the Greek Polis, although it certainly exerted a profound influence on political evolution, still failed to perpetuate itself, and has never really been revived, we may suggest that the position which women occupied in that system and its educational institutions must enter largely into the explanation.

The Roman character was at once simpler and sterner than the Greek. It lacked subtlety but it possessed strength. It is common to contrast the two nations as typical, respectively, of utilitarian and cultural ideals. To note the difference which marked their treatment of women, and the value they attached to home life, is to touch upon a divergence even more significant in its results. As with the Hebrew, so with the Roman, the family was more than a political unit. Pre-eminently it was for centuries the only medium of education. The despotic character of the *patria potestas* is proverbial; but worthy of note also is the sense of responsibility which was considered to accompany that authority; and still more so is the care with which not the father alone, but in a still greater degree the mother watched over the education of the children. The mother of the Gracchi was only a typical Roman matron. If, as we are told, the quality of gentleness in Roman motherhood was hidden beneath a veil of harshness, the lack of grace need be no great fault in our eyes; when we remember that the contrasted ideal, which in later times at least enhanced the value of this,

was that of the extremely emancipated lady of Greece. The contrast is similar to that between a Puritan mother and a *demi-mondaine* of the Restoration. It is not certain that before Rome came into contact with Hellenism there were any Roman schools at all.[1] It is certain that if schools were established they were considered as supplementing and not supplanting the home.[2] With the influx of Hellenic influence, particularly after the fall of Macedon in 168 B.C., primary schools of a Greek type were widely established, and the system remained until the Empire began to decay

[1] The evidence is meagre. It is probable that if there were schools they were co-educational. Livy (iii. 44), in relating the story of Virginia (449 B.C.), says that when seized she was on her way to school in the forum. [Virgini, venienti in forum (ibi namque in tabernis literarum ludi erant) . . .] M. Boissier seems convinced that the system was widespread. " Dans les maisons riches, les jeunes filles étaient élevées comme leur frères, par des esclaves lettrés ; elles recevaient les mêmes leçons, on les faisait étudier dans les mêmes livres . . . les plébéiennes étaient envoyées aux écoles publiques sur le forum. . . ." (" La Réligion Romaine," Book II., p. 241.) The reference in Livy, who is perhaps writing imaginatively, is a rather flimsy basis for the sweeping statement of the last sentence. A similar question arises with regard to the schools established later under Hellenic influence. That Co-education prevailed in the primary schools is suggested by two well-known references in Martial.

> praelegat ut tumidus rauca te voce magister
> oderit et *grandis virgo bonusque puer*
> [Epig., viii. 3.15.]
>
> invisum *pueris virginibusque* caput
> [*Ibid.*, ix. 68.]

There is further a tombstone at Capua with a representation of an old schoolmaster with a boy on one side and a girl on the other.

[2] *Cf.* A. S. Wilkins' " Roman Education," p. 15. Parental control did not cease even after the assumption of the *toga virilis*.

at the end of the second century after Christ. Secondary or "grammar" schools were also founded, although the practice of keeping a Greek tutor in the house, which was begun in the second century B.C., was continued in many cases. The tendency of schools to attend rather to intellectual than to moral training was viewed with suspicion by Romans of the old type, who recognised here the superiority of the home. It was some time before cultural training was admitted to be as important as professional; and although Cicero's account (in "De Oratore") of the requisites of an orator necessitates a good deal of what we should regard as culture, this aspect was subordinated to the practical importance of oratory in political life. It is significant too that the decay of political freedom under the Empire reacted upon the schools, which rapidly deteriorated when their chief utilitarian value disappeared. As is well known, the writers of the first century A.D. were never weary of lamenting the decay of old Roman institutions, and there are many tears shed for the degradation of home life. Tacitus is particularly sorrowful over the substitution of the nurse for the mother and the delegation of a father's responsibility to the schoolmaster.[1] Quintilian enters

[1] "Dialogus de Oratoribus," § 28, 29, 34, 35 (dialogue supposed to take place *c.* A.D. 75): "Nam pridem suus cuique filius, ex casta parente natus, non in cellula emptae nutricis sed *in gremio ac sinu matris* educabatur, cuius praecipua laus erat tueri domum et inservire liberis. . . . At nunc natus infans delegatur Graeculae alicui ancillae cui adiungitur unus aut alter ex omnibus servis plerumque vilissimus. . . . Ergo apud maiores nostros iuvenis ille qui foro et eloquentiae parabatur *imbutus iam domestica disciplina*

upon a full discussion of the merits of home and school education respectively, and incidentally throws some light on the state of schools and public opinion about them.[1] He admits that there are dangers in herding boys together at an age when they are "prone to vice," and that moral ruin is no infrequent result of school education. His answer—it is hardly final—is that the homes at that time were often quite as bad as the schools. He sees the importance, but allows the difficulty, of a restriction in numbers. He appears to recognise good grounds for the distinction which our Public—but not our co-educational—schools find it necessary to make between a preparatory and a later stage. He is emphatic on the necessity of high moral standards as the first requisite of the teacher.

The Court was generally the centre of Roman vice. But there were not wanting among the emperors men who loved to look back to the old ways. The austerity of Augustus in family life is well known. It was carried so far that he even rebuked a handsome young noble who dared to call on his daughter when she spent the week-end at Baiae![2] Marcus Aurelius, in expressing his gratitude to those who had helped him, honours

. . . deducebatur a patre vel a propinquis ad eum oratorem qui principem in civitate locum obtinebat. . . . At nunc adulescentuli nostri deducuntur in scholas istorum [? scenicorum] qui rhetores vocantur." Even allowing for Tacitean exaggeration, we must suppose some good ground for these complaints.

[1] "Institutiones Oratoriae," Book I., Chapter II.; Book II., Chapter II.

[2] Suetonius, "Vita Divi Augusti," § 64: "L Vinicio claro decoroque iuveni scripserit quondam, parum modeste fecisse eum, quod filiam suam Baias salutatum venisset."

his great-grandfather for preventing him from attending a Public School![1]

The attitude of the best Romans towards this gift of Greece to her captors was not unlike that of early Christian Fathers, like Tertullian and St Chrysostom, to the same system when it was thoroughly engrafted upon the Roman Empire. They desired the intellectual, but they questioned the moral gain. As for the question of Co-education, Professor Stanley Hall's "instinctive aversion" was natural enough, when Hellenism dominated the schools, but it requires no further explanation. Roman girls had no part in the schools, but were frequently educated by tutors at home in the higher as well as the lower branches of learning. But the influence of women on society was profound and no doubt staved off the dissolution of the Empire. The high ideal of womanhood which characterised Republican times remained as a tradition strong enough to influence a later age, and also enabled women to share in the new culture without loss of honour. That the aspersions cast on women by the satirical writers of the first century A.D. were exaggerated is well shown by M. Boissier,[2] who brings many instances to prove that women not only exerted a beneficial moral influence in private life, but also moved in public circles and purified the air they breathed.[3]

[1] M. Aurelius, "Meditations," Chapter I.

[2] "La Réligion Romaine," Book III., Chapter II.

[3] Dill asserts that their influence continued to the last: "In the last age of the Western Empire there was no deterioration in the

We may perhaps consider as a final indication of the hesitancy of the Romans explicitly to regard the school rather than the home as the training-ground of character, the fact that for long they denied the schools official recognition and support. It was not till Imperial times that education was subsidised by the State, and when in A.D. 425. Theodosius and Valentinian asserted the Imperial authority over all schools, decay had already begun to sap the vitals of the body politic.[1]

Meanwhile under the shadow of the Empire and its contemptuous tolerance, a new influence was touching the hearts of men. Christianity, in opening the vision of mankind to views beyond the compass of the deepest Greek philosophy or the oldest religions of the East, altered the perspective of the human conscience, and illumined the problems of terrestrial existence with light reflected from another world. In two particulars especially was there a supplanting

position and influence of women"—"Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire," p. 163.

[1] We can scarcely leave the subject of Roman schools without some reference to Musonius, a writer of the latter half of the first century A.D., who argues for Co-education in a somewhat abstract philosophical manner. His main argument is that the virtues required by men and women are alike—good sense, justice, self-control and courage; they will therefore need a similar education. He is not, however, averse to the provision of "electives," and would allow girls to substitute spinning for gymnastics. Philosophy is to be studied by both sexes, because they both have the same reason, and they both need to study the art of living. He is emphatic on the point that learning does not destroy the charm of womanhood.

and transcending of ancient ideals. The meaning of personality was for the first time recognised, with its corollaries of individual responsibility and worth. What Stoicism negatively apprehended, Christianity erected into a positive and effectual creed. Secondly, the spirituality of human nature was revealed ; and education, which at first became a definite preparation for immortality, at a later stage, when the reaction against mortal corruption had returned somewhat from its early extreme, was conceived also as a means of establishing the Kingdom of God in the heart of the existing world. There proceeded from both these discoveries alike a realisation of the power and beauty of womanhood and a new conception of human love. It was this Christian ideal which, upon the fall of the Empire, absorbed what was best in the old Roman tradition, and united with the still pure manners of northern barbarians to fashion the chivalry of the Middle Ages, and lay the foundation of all that is noble in our modern conception of sex relationship.

At first there was no conflict between Christian education and the schools of Rome. The latter were largely aristocratic, and Christianity found the bulk of its early converts among the humble and meek of the earth. And indeed for long the home alone was considered the natural school.[1] The influence of the mother was relied upon both to instruct the youth in religion, and to keep him unspotted from the

[1] A. T. Drane, "Christian Schools and Scholars," pp. 24, 25: "... the education received in primitive times by the children of the faithful, in the bosoms of their own families. Fleury points out

corruptions of the world. It was indeed almost impossible that Christian children should attend schools where the forms of paganism were not only observed but blended with the common life.[1] The school system of Christianity began with the instruction of probationary converts in "catechumenal" institutions. And since the propagation of the faith was one of the main duties of the Christian, schools for the instruction of teachers also arose. Pagan culture, after some hesitation,[2] was included in the course along with theological training, and was thus attained without risk of contamination from pagan religion. These "catechetical" schools were often established in bishops' houses.

An interesting parallel has been drawn between the education of the clergy in this way by their bishops and the training of pages and squires in the baronial castles.[3] The "cathedral" or "canonical"

to his readers as one proof of the care taken by Christian parents in the instruction of their children, that in all antiquity we do not find the least notice of any public catechism for children, or any public instruction for those who had been baptised before they came to the use of reason. It was not needed, he says, for in those days, to use the words of St Chrysostom, 'every house was a church.' The office of religious instruction generally devolved on the mother."

[1] Boissier, "La Fin de Paganisme," vol. i., p. 200 (quoted in "Primitive Christian Education," G. Hodgson, p. 188).

[2] "Primitive Christian Education," Chapter VII.

[3] St Palaye, "Mémoires de l'Ancienne Chevalerie (edition of 1759), vol. i., p. 46: "L'éducation que les Evêques se chargeoient de donner aux jeunes clercs qui leur étoient attachés a beaucoup de ressemblance avec celle que les Ecuyers recevoient des Chevaliers, et confirme l'idée que nos anciens auteurs ont eue de faire un

schools of later times (from which many of our English Public Schools have arisen) were an expansion of this institution. It is important to note that the primary object of these schools, as of the monastic schools, which were modelled upon them, was training, not for the world, not even simply for the future life, but definitely for the Church. That is a fact which, combined with the special influence of monasticism, was decisive in its effect on the subsequent trend of education. The sacrifice which the Church demanded, its exaggerated alienation from the world, the rigid ideal of asceticism—these things united to impress upon the education, not only of the clergy, but necessarily to a large extent of the laity, a character which it retained long after the special justification had diminished, if not disappeared. The Church is thus ultimately responsible for much that is obsolete in the traditions of modern English education. It held an attitude towards women, and the question of sex relationship in general, which, however high in its motive, was based upon an ultimately mistaken ideal, and has given birth to much of the hide-bound prejudice and gross stupidity which surround the whole problem to-day.

Monasticism was not the invention of Christianity.

paralèlle assez exact entre la Prélature et la Chevalerie. Les maisons de Chevaliers considérées sous ce point de vûe, étoient les séminaires de Ecuyers. Chaque Evêque, dit M. de Fleuri, prenoit un soin particulier de l'instruction de son clergé, principalement des jeunes clercs qui étoient continuellement attachés à sa personne pour lui servir de lecteurs et de secrétaires, le suivre et porter ses lettres et ses ordres, etc."

But the Christian institution is its most perfect form, and it is through Christianity that it has influenced the life and, not least, the education of the modern Western world. Christian asceticism was the resultant partly of a natural reaction against the vices of the Roman world, and partly of a strange blending of Christian thought with that vague mysticism which illumined the twilight of the old pagan philosophies. In a world where all the powers seemed on the side of evil, it was not unnatural that the Christian, like Plato's philosopher king, should seek to shelter himself from the storm and wind behind a wall. But his sweeping condemnation of the world tended to include much that is essential to full humanity. Mortification became almost as much honoured for the contempt it showed for the body as for the benefits it conferred on the soul. It is strangely paradoxical that the religion which imparted an element of divinity to human affections, and created an ideal of womanhood, at the same time attached so exaggerated a value to celibacy.[1] Thus it came about that the Christian ideal of womanhood in practice fell short of perfection owing to other developments of the same religion. The fact that both theological doctrine and

[1] See Archdeacon Wilson in "Good Citizenship": "Of course it is well known that this teaching (of Christ) was misrepresented, and degenerated into the advocacy of forced celibacy. This practice began with the desire to set the priest free from all ties, and to enable him to devote himself wholly to his work. It was stimulated by the Eastern spirit of asceticism, and fostered by ecclesiastical leaders. But it led to fearful abuses, and was one of the greatest obstacles to real Christianity."

(certainly after the fourth century) Church administration were in the hands of men, impressed a masculine point of view on the whole of Christian thought. It was sought to lessen the difficulties of celibacy to the aspiring masculine soul by exaggerating the sinfulness of human reproduction, and thus inevitably casting a slur of inferiority upon the sex which is the more concerned with it. It is curious how this point of view has persisted at least in the Roman Catholic Church even among women.[1] The effect of this practice upon the education of both sexes, at a time when education was primarily for the Church, was of course to stamp it with a monastic character. The history of the Christian era therefore presents this curious inconsistency, that, while the relations of the sexes in the world were purified and elevated by the high ideal of Christianity, the system of education which grew up under the tutelage of the Church was inspired by an ideal which was not indeed the opposite of the other, but was certainly a negation of it. Accidents of history helped to perpetuate the monastic type. When the barbarians swept over the

[1] For an illustration see Mrs A. T. Drane *op. cit.*, p. 59: "St Ambrose who introduced the chant into Milan, permitted women to join in the chanting of the Psalms, *a custom which degenerated in some churches into the establishment of female choirs*; though this abuse was prohibited by many popes and councils."
Also *ibid.*, p. 52., Act. S. S. Boll., quoted without protest: "One half of this holy city (Lismore) is *a sanctuary into which no woman may enter.*" (Italics ours.)
For the attitude of the early Church *cf.* "No woman may receive the Eucharist with naked hands" (Decree of Council of Auxerre, 578).

Western Empire in the fifth century, they almost wiped out both the Imperial and municipal school system of pagan Rome and the episcopal schools of the Church. The strictly monastic schools (those, namely, which were attached to monasteries [1]), being of later origin than the others and therefore less developed, to a great extent survived. Education accordingly went on with an equally ecclesiastical and an even greater monastic bias. If the sons of the nobility attended these schools, they received very much the same training as those who were preparing for the Church. A distinction was indeed made between interior or claustral schools and exterior schools,[2] the former being for the junior monks and the latter only for secular pupils. But " the constitution of all these schools was most strictly ecclesiastical, and though seculars were admitted to share in their advantages, they were primarily intended for the education of the clergy . . . it is undeniable that in the ecclesiastical schools the liberal arts were chiefly cultivated in their relation to the things of faith." [3] Even after the scholastic revival and the introduction

[1] There is some evidence that girls as well as boys attended these schools. Morison (" St Basil and his Rule," p. 102) seems to show that girls attended the monastery schools at least in the Greek Church, apparently to the age of sixteen or seventeen. There is also evidence in St Basil of the distinction between exterior and interior schools or pupils (St Basil, Opera II., 740 A, inquires *εἰ χρὴ ἐν ἀδελφότητι βιωτικῶν εἶναι διδάσκαλον*).

[2] *Cf.* the distinction which still obtains between " *scholastici* " and " *externi* " in the Jesuit University course.

[3] " Christian Schools and Scholars," p. 399.

of a lay element the Church retained control by forbidding anyone to open a school without a licence from the " scholasticus " of the bishop's school. Mr Leach says definitely that the monks had little to do with English education ; that before the Reformation Chantry Schools were the commonest type, and of others those connected with cathedrals and collegiate churches formed the great majority.[1] But the monastic ideal was still the ideal of the whole Church. After centuries of dispute, the Lateran Council of 1215 pronounced emphatically against the marriage of priests. A document called " Instructions for Parish Priests," dating from not later than the middle of the fifteenth century, shows that although marriage was fairly common, it was reprobated[2] ; Edward VI. and Elizabeth somewhat relaxed the strictness of the rule, while Mary enforced it. And although conditions and ideas are much changed at the present day, the celibate ideal for the priesthood is still held by some in the Anglican Church. The influence of this ideal has been decisive both in determining the character of English Public School education and in retarding the progress of women.

[1] " English Schools at the Reformation."
[2] " Women in English Life."—G. Hill.

CHAPTER IV

THE HISTORICAL ARGUMENT (*continued*)

THE claim of the Church to hold dominion over the whole range of human life, and to centre in herself all aspirations and ideals, was yet not powerful enough to defeat " the subtlety of nature." The Wickliffite and Albigensian movements were not the first indications before the Reformation that the authority of Rome was felt as a limiting influence on certain expressions of the free human spirit. The institution of Chivalry which lasted through the Middle Ages was not indeed originated as a movement hostile to the Church. None the less it undoubtedly rose in response to needs the Church left unsupplied. Christianity revealed the value of personality ; but the rigid organisation of Christian society in a hierarchic Church tended to cancel the gain. Concentration on other-worldliness obscured the worth and beauty of human relationship in this world. Ideals of personal honour and physical courage, individual loves and loyalties, joys of contest and victory over powers more material than the Satanic—these may have been small things in the eyes of the Church, but in a warlike age they were assuredly powerful motives among men. The warrior traditions

of the northern races still survived. Neither had the corruptions of the Roman Empire destroyed that reverence for women which from of old obtained among them. From these among other causes sprang Chivalry.

Of this institution, which embodied and expressed so much of what was best in the life of the Middle Ages, our concern here is with two aspects in particular—its effect on the relations of men and women, and its influence on education.

The quarrels of knight and monk have left graphic traces in mutual abuse; terrible things are spoken by monkish chroniclers of the wickedness of such as made their knighthood but a cloak for wantonness. But the judgment of competent historians vindicates the claim of Chivalry to have purified and ennobled the relations between men and women.[1] It was not only that it revived the feeling for Romance which had vanished with the death of the pagan gods, or that in so doing it added to human affection that element of spirituality which seems so strangely absent from the loves of the early world. But it boldly walked where the Church had feared to tread, and for the fugitive virtue of the cloister it substituted a more effectual ideal of service and love. No doubt

[1] *E.g.* Hallam's "History of the Middle Ages," Chapter IX., Part II.: "But the best school of moral discipline which the Middle Ages afforded was the institution of chivalry . . . our most sceptical criticism must assign a decisive influence to this great source of human improvement."
As the Rev. J. N. Figgis writes: "Always rather by its ideals than by its achievements do we judge a nation or an epoch."

there were dangers in the exaggerated and sometimes artificial adoration of the knight for his lady-love; and those who affected to treat women as angels were sometimes capable of conduct paradoxically diabolic.

But the fact that the Church, for all its monasticism, gave authoritative sanction to the institution,[1] is a further indication of what indeed is not otherwise disputable, that Chivalry was looked upon as an expression of Christian ideals; and there can be no doubt that it diffused an air of gentleness and courtesy over the manners of a barbaric age, and above all, by its definite inclusion of purity among the requisites of true manliness, effected an ideal union of qualities which the custom of men has too often kept apart. And we are assured that women profited equally with men from the high standards set before them.[2]

The educational system of Chivalry was naturally of a very different order from that of the Church. It has a peculiar interest in the present connection as showing that, while the English nobility of to-day look upon the Public School for their sons and the High School for their daughters as the only natural and proper training-ground, their ancestors preferred a system the essential advantages of which for both

[1] In the eleventh century. "It was intended they (*i.e.* chivalric institutions) should be spread over the whole face of Christendom, in order to check the barbarism and ferocity of the times."—Mill's "History of Chivalry," vol. i., p. 13.

[2] St Palaye *op. cit.*, p. 135.

sexes can hardly be reproduced to-day save in a co-educational boarding school. The feudal castles were schools of Chivalry for both boys and girls. The son of a noble house was detached at the age of seven from his mother's apron strings, and sent to the castle of a feudal lord to be brought up with other boys and girls of his class [1] in all the graces and accomplishments of Chivalry. For the first seven years he was in the immediate care of the lady of the house, punctilious attendance upon whom was the first of his duties ; from her he learnt at once the Christian doctrine and the rules of courtesy. From the age of fourteen onwards his education in the capacity of a squire (*écuyer*) was naturally of a more masculine and martial character. But the development of his muscles was not suffered to abate the gentleness of his mien. As he passed from adolescence to manhood the forms of courtesy he had been taught to use to the other sex no doubt assumed a more significant character, and perhaps the verses he had laboriously and, it may be, sadly composed in honour of an arbitrarily chosen lady-love began to exhibit a more personal and genuine tone. His sister meantime was trained beneath the same roof in all useful arts and accomplishments. She was not "finished" as girls were in

[1] Although the order of knighthood created a class certainly more distinctive than the aristocracy of to-day, there was apparently less exclusiveness then than exists in our best Public Schools. For we are told, "Every feudal lord had his court, to which he drew *the sons and daughters of the poorer gentry of his domain* ; and his castle was frequented by the children of men of equal rank with himself."—Mills *op. cit.*, p. 31.

Victorian England, and, alas! still are in Fifth Georgian days, albeit they must now be exported for the operation. Not seldom she was better read than her brother: in an age, when men of the noble class were mostly given to warlike pursuits, and women spent the greater part of their time indoors, it was natural that the latter should devote more attention to books. But the education of the girl was not confined to lessons. She entertained the knights who visited her castle; she inspired the heroes who went forth to slay not indeed dragons, but other heroes; she attended to their needs on their return—if they returned—and, above all, she dressed their wounds. Not the least romantic fact in that age of Romance is the circumstance that young ladies were not only nurses but doctors. Such knowledge of surgery as was then to be obtained was as much a part of a girl's education in those times[1] as was the art of embroidering ecclesiastical slippers in after times. In those dangerous years of adolescence, during which some people would apparently wish to have boys at the north and girls at the south pole respectively, these youths and maidens of old England met, it is too true, with alarming frequency. Marriages between those who met in the castles were not unknown.[2] That there was a certain artificiality about chivalric manners has been granted. But the conventional courtesy of modern gentlemanliness is hardly less

[1] St Palaye *op. cit.*, vol. i., p. 13 *et seq.*

[2] *Ibid*: "Quelle union ne devoient point former des alliances établies sur de pareils fondemens?"

artificial.[1] And the chief danger in modern conventionality as compared with mediæval is that it is far more loosely associated with the moral code. Now that the Devil is scarcely mentioned in polite circles, we do not always feel the same need for a close association of ethical principles with daily life as was felt when the Devil was in his prime.

The beginnings of Chivalry may be traced even before the time of Charlemagne ; and the chivalric method of education was still usual with the nobility of England in Tudor times and even later. Until the universities became fashionable in the sixteenth century, they were the resort of the poor rather than of the rich. Noblemen's daughters were indeed often educated in convent schools, but the three hundred grammar schools, which, as Mr Leach has shown, were in existence by 1546, were mainly the resort of the new middle class, although Winchester and Eton even in those days were the preserves of aristocracy. In regard to this chivalric system which so long held the field, it is particularly interesting to note the judgment of Mrs Drane, whose strong Roman Catholic sympathies free her from suspicion of partiality for an institution which had little in common with ecclesiasticism : " Despite all the extravagances of Chivalry, and the exaggerated and injurious effect of

[1] *Cf.* A. Ponsonby in " The Decline of Aristocracy," p. 311 : " But it is chiefly a question of manners and has nothing whatever to do with morals. The gentleman's treatment of women, though superficially graceful and deferential, does not affect the essentials of sex relationship."

some of its maxims . . . it enforced a law of self-restraint and polite diction and etiquette, and a government of the exterior man, in all which the education of our own day is fatally defective. . . . Family life was then a reality and not a name . . . in such families we are justified in saying that as a general rule, the grand Christian traditions were certainly upheld ; that children were taught to be subject to parents and governors, and parents were held bound personally to superintend the education of their children ; that there was a real parental rule ; that priests were held in worshipful honour, and the poor regarded as members of Christ, women treated with respect and courtesy, and elders held in reverence. The domestic virtues were taught after another fashion than among ourselves, and whilst the education of a gentleman aimed at making him brave, clement, courteous and devout, a high-born lady was trained to a life of vigorous and practical utility. . . . The system of education which prevailed presented them with a high ideal of moral excellence, a lofty standard of thoughts and desires, precisely that the loss of which among ourselves is so bitterly deplored." [1]

It should be noted that the solidarity of the family in feudal times was much greater than it is now. The introduction of primogeniture with the Norman Conquest (as a definite policy aiming at the creation of great families to support the Crown) "spread through all classes down to the lowest" ; and when

[1] "Christian Schools and Scholars," Chapter XIV.

land was the only important form of property, the close connection between property and the family naturally tended to consolidate the latter.[1]

In another way, too, the expanding life of the Middle Ages influenced education, and to some extent created a breach in the monopoly of the Church. The influence of the crusades in furthering international communication, the growth of geographical knowledge and the development of industry, called into existence a commercial class with special interests and aspirations. Trades were organised in guilds, and the apprenticeship system involved a kind of industrial education. Soon the guilds began to establish schools of their own [2]; in these schools most of the work was done in English, and subjects came to be included in the *curriculum* which were of a more practical character than the strict classical tradition allowed. They were still, however, largely conducted by the priests, partly, no doubt, because the guilds

[1] Bosanquet, "The Family," Chapter VI.

[2] Mr Leach (*op. cit.*, p. 34) says: "Of the thirty-three guilds mentioned in these records (*i.e.* of pre-Reformation schools), excluding the Craft Guilds of London and Shrewsbury and the Merchants' Guild at York, twenty-eight kept Grammar Schools." For instances see Toulmin Smith, "The English Gilds," p. 202: "From the Report of the Gild of S. Nicholas (in Worcester) by the Commissioners of Henry VIII. 'Memorand, that John Olyver, clerke, is now scholemaster there, and hath yerely tenn markes for his wagis.'" Some years later this same John Olyver is said to have had under him "aboue the number of a hundred scolers." For the priest see *ibid.*, p. 221 (Gild of Stratford-upon-Avon): "And there be, at thys present tyme (1546) v. prestes; whereof one a Scholemaster of Gramer, and celebratyng dyvyne seruyce w^th^ a Chapelle stondying in the myddes of the same."

had a religious side, and partly because the priests still held a practical monopoly of teaching.

There is another aspect of guild organisation which has a considerable bearing on the argument of this chapter, because it throws much light on the whole question of sex relationship in past times. Considering the attitude of modern Trade Unionism, it is curious to note that the guilds, which are popularly regarded as the ancestors of the Trade Unions, recognised an industrial equality between men and women. We are told *e.g.* that women "could receive apprentices; they became members of trade guilds and worked at various industries; in short, played their part as full members of the industrial community." [1] Very interesting too is this further comment: ". . . it was not felt unseemly for men and women to work side by side, nor are there any evidences that such a proceeding led to immoral conduct . . . custom proved a safeguard." [2] That this ideal state of things no longer obtains in industry, and has not yet been arrived at in the more important sphere of school, is also due in some measure to custom—but very perverse custom.[3] No doubt the Industrial Revolution has changed the conditions of industry and has created

[1] "Women in English Life," p. 39.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

[3] It is pleasing to hear that the old custom is not unknown. See an article in *Everyman*, 14th March 1913, "The Mill Girl": "A camaraderie exists between her and the male hands unknown in other branches of industrialism. This camaraderie of the sexes is the more remarkable because necessarily there is a certain amount of competition between them."

new problems in sex relationship. But it is perhaps not wholly without signficance that the Industrial Revolution came at a time when the position of women in this country was in many ways lower than it had ever been before. And there is no doubt whatever that that position, arrived at through a long course of historical events, was originally determined by the attitude of the Church on the question and the prevalence of its monastic ideals.

The close association of the guilds with civic life led to a merging of the Guild Schools with the Burgher Schools which were being founded about the same time by the growing towns.[1] The chief interest of these schools is that they, in common with the education of Chivalry, are an indication that the training of the cleric or clerk in the monastic establishment was not the sole ideal of the Middle Ages. Nevertheless it was the latter which determined the general character of education, and produced the stereotyped form from which the English Public School has grown. The Church is immortal, but Chivalry, as Hallam says, was blown to pieces by the simple invention of gunpowder. Chivalry was more concerned with fighting than with learning ; but Minerva prevailed over Mars in the field of the schools. The education of the castle

[1] These schools show the beginning of " secular " control or initiation of schools. " Chantry " schools were similarly absorbed. These were founded by pious benefactors to lessen for themselves the pains of purgatory. For an instance see " Cambridge History of Modern Literature," vii. 329: " Roger of Lupton in 1528 had founded a chantry (at Sedbergh) ' to pray for his sowle and kepe a free schole.' "

was for the few ; the Church ministered to the many. The pen of the scholar therefore proved mightier than the sword of the chevalier; the more easily when the scholar was a priest. In essentials the Renaissance made little difference in the situation ; and seventy years ago the English Public School was much the same as it had been three centuries previously, thereby presenting to the world the finest example in history of the dogged persistence of an obsolete tradition. In its monastic aspect the tradition still survives, its anomalous character obscured by long use and familiarity. Had it been the fashion for a thousand years to take milk and sugar with whisky, we should perhaps scarcely notice it now. None the less such a practice would be absurd, if not criminal. Perhaps the strangest circumstance about the whole business is that the tentacles of this ancient octopus are in these days fastened upon no class so securely as upon that equally ancient nobility, which in its more agile days was most successful in eluding the horrid grasp.

One of the distinguished sons of Oxford has written in immortal words of his Alma Mater that she whispers "from her towers the last enchantments of the Middle Age." But one of those enchantments has never been hers to whisper.[1] Nothing in that lost age,

[1] And it is not long since any approach thereto was decried even from her pulpits. See a sermon preached "before the University of Oxford," on Trinity Sunday 1884, by Dean Burgon, who held forth to this effect anent the "inexpediency and immodesty" of introducing women to a share in academic advantages: "I will

remote at so many points from our modern ideals, and yet instinct with a joy and an art of living which are no longer ours—nothing appeals more to the student than the ease and freedom which marked the position of *a few* women in social life. Those who were high in the social scale were not seldom better educated than contemporary men ; and that in solid as well as in superficial accomplishments. And although the influence of the Church was on the whole against them, and tended to limit their social activities except within its own sphere, they yet contrived to occupy some position and to wield a certain influence in public life. They were not unrecognised in the feudal system ; they were even called out sometimes for military service—although they usually sent substitutes ![1] " Abbesses . . . were summoned to Anglo-Norman parliaments, as they had been summoned to Anglo-Saxon Witenagemots." [2] The guilds, as we have seen, admitted women as well as men. Those who were " freewomen " of the towns enjoyed the privileges of burgesses—extending even, it would seem, to the exercise of the Parliamentary Franchise.[3] But the Dean Burgons of the time frowned

but say that even though the marriageable maidens, who will hereafter resort hither in their beauty, shall every one prove to be like that 'fair vestal throned in the west' of whom the poet speaks—shall all, *all* pass on 'in maiden meditation, fancy free' —*he* must be utterly unacquainted with his kind, who affects to doubt that the disturbing influence thus brought to bear on academic life, will be of a mischievous—not to say of a most disastrous description; will in fact be fatal."

[1] Mrs C. C. Stopes, " British Freewomen."

[2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*

upon the extension of the sphere of "woman, to whom it brings shame even to reflect of what nature she is" [1]; and the movements which really led the way to emancipation drew their strength from other sources.

The Renaissance and the Reformation, in breaking down the long despotism of the Church, exercised a wide influence not only on education, but also on the position of women. The Church, as Draper says,[2] had "compelled women to domestic life, shut them out from the priesthood and tried to exclude them from government." There had not been wanting throughout the Christian era women of great intellectual distinction in high places; but one may say of them that their learning was strictly subordinated to their piety, and there is little hint of that greater freedom and wider range which marked the spirit of Humanism. But already in the early fifteenth century in Italy there were signs of change. It is possible to exaggerate the extent to which the emancipation of women was carried at the time,[3] but the change in principle was profound and has had far-reaching effects. Indeed there are points in which the humanistic ideal of women's education may well be considered as preferable to certain modern theories. In those days the recognition of women's rights in the things of the intellect did not blind either men or

[1] St Clement of Alexandria.

[2] "Intellectual Development of Europe," vol. ii., p. 137.

[3] Their greater intellectual freedom soon brought women into conflict with established social conventions, and the conventions

women to the supreme importance of the home and the social circle as the highest sphere for the exercise of woman's special gifts. Of the women, whose intellectual brilliance added to the lustre which surrounds the civic life of fifteenth-century Italy, we are told: " . . . those whose fame has come down to us, and they must be representatives of a large number, strike us as thoroughly womanly in temperament, not seldom of strong practical gifts, and respected in their own day not less for their domestic virtues than for their refinement and cultivation." [1]

Since Humanism sometimes at least was on questionable terms with Orthodoxy, it was not likely that it should flourish in the Church Schools. It centred in the Court Schools, such as that established by Vittorina da Feltre at Mantua. These schools are particularly interesting for several reasons. They stood for a much wider ideal of education than had previously been recognised [2]; they combined something of home life with the scholastic *curriculum*; and in some degree at least they admitted girls. Their real forerunners were the schools which grew up at the courts of Charlemagne and Alfred the Great,

were very strong. When the learned Isotta ventured so far as to correspond with her teacher Guarino, she came " under the ban of the social opinion of Verona."—Woodward, " Vittorino da Feltre," p. 249.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 250.

[2] Woodward *op. cit.*, p. 36: " The aim of the true humanist educator was to secure the harmonious development of mind, body and character."

which were also in a measure co-educational.[1] In Vittorino's school the daughters of the Gonzaga family (for which the school was primarily instituted) were educated along with their brothers and the youths of other noble families. Cecilia Gonzaga was learning Greek grammar at the age of seven, and quickly became proficient.[2]

In Northern Europe the Renaissance was closely connected with the Reformation, and to this connection perhaps is due that emphasis on the social and ethical aspects of education which characterised reformers of the period. The great educational work of the Reformation was the establishment of primary schools, as an expression of the principle that individuality is all-important, and the corollary that education should be universal. Luther would have girls educated as well as boys, and both primarily for citizenship ; and in common with other reformers he laid stress on the importance of home as well as school training. With the main current of the Humanist movement in England we are not much concerned ;

[1] Mullinger, "The Schools of Charles the Great," pp. 69, 83. Charles' sister, wife and daughter attended the school, and many noble youths not likely to have been more than sixteen or seventeen years of age.
Also Giles' "Life and Times of Alfred the Great," p. 297. Two of Alfred's children, Edward and Ethelswitha, were brought up in the Court along with "the children of almost all the nobility of the country and many also who were not noble" (quoted from Asser). A similar custom with regard to the children of the nobility evidently obtained in ancient Persia. See Xen. Anab. I. 9.

[2] Woodward *op. cit.*, p. 249.

no doubt some life was breathed into the excessive formalism of mediæval education, but a new formalism succeeded ere long, and it is questionable whether classical education since the Renaissance has until quite recently been much more valuable in schools than it was before.[1] But it is interesting to note that Erasmus, who did so much for education, was no great supporter of the monastic boarding school—and that for other reasons besides his objections to monastic control. " He has nothing but denunciation for the monastic boarding school removed from public observation and control " ; and this partly because " the existing schools are thoroughly unsatisfactory," but partly—a more fundamental objection—because " there is further the risk of herding a large gathering of boys together ; for inevitably in such a mingling of characters evil has an undue chance." [2] It is true that Erasmus (himself, be it remembered, a monk) was suspicious of feminine influences. But of that we are told " his intense distrust . . . is directly due to his contempt for the ordinary training of the women of his day." If Miss Manning has given us a faithful picture of the times in " The Household of Sir Thomas More," we cannot think that Erasmus either felt or expressed contempt for the learned young women he met and conversed with there. One thing is clear about the rules he laid down for the education of girls

[1] A virulent specimen of this later formalism still survives in the " Honour Moderations " course at Oxford—not, possibly, in theory, but certainly in practice.

[2] Woodward, " Erasmus concerning Education," p. 92.

—that he wished it be be carried out in the home and not by the religious orders.

It must be admitted that, although the Reformation and Renaissance gave birth to ideas which altered for ever the status of women, the immediate effect of the former in England was to throw back the cause of women's education. The dissolution of the nunneries deprived women of their only means of organised education; and the reaction of the Reformation against asceticism tended to confine women very closely to the domestic sphere. For English Humanism being less independent of ecclesiasticism than the Italian movement, owing to the parallel advance of the Church in England, was perhaps more fearful on that very account of feminine emancipation. The ascetic ideal did not disappear from the Church with the Reformation, and the monastic method still held the field when no other system of public education had as yet been evolved; and for girls it was more truly monastic than for boys. There was a possibility of married priests but certainly not of married nuns. In other ways too women felt the loss of that protection which had been extended to them by the Church. For the Church of Rome, in spite of its general attitude to women, has always made great use of them. In the Middle Ages women who had taken the veil could engage upon a wide field of social activity. The nun, as Miss Hill says, was "teacher, philanthropist, doctor or nurse." [1] But "the religious had the field to themselves," and with the disappearance

[1] "Women in English Life," p. 58.

of " the religious " women's social activities came almost altogether to an end. But if Puritanism restricted women to the home it enhanced the value of home life both for parents and children. " The household teaching of the nobles was intensified incomparably in the household training of the citizens of the new middle class in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and manners and morals were of course inculcated with even keener zest in the home than in the school." A deepened religious feeling brought with it a finer sense of personal responsibility ; and Puritan motherhood was a very beautiful thing. Now that the ideals of Chivalry had done their work, it was a gain that the artificiality which remained should be superseded by a saner view of the equality of men and women. There were losses, of course. In a world of stern conflict it is the natural tendency of human endeavours after good to verge to the extreme ; and of the baleful effects of Puritanism there is none more pathetic than that degradation of woman's ancient power of healing and gift of ministration, which had descended through chivalric institutions from earlier ancestral traditions, to the fearful and barbaric superstition of witchcraft. For the crimes committed under the influence of that superstition Puritanism must bear a heavy share of blame.

When one reviews the seventeenth century as a whole, it is evident that women were sadly bandied about between the Scylla of Puritan sternness and the Charybdis of Cavalier, or, worse still, Restoration gallantry. Among human documents there are few

more interesting than that "serious proposal to the ladies" which Mary Astell, "a lover of her sex," made in 1694. She would have them flee for a space from the world into a religious retirement (she explicitly rejects the term "monastery") and there cultivate both spirit and intellect, so making themselves better women as well as better wives. The emphasis on the "women" is significant as sounding the first note of that woman's movement, which, beginning then, has continued ever since. Her hand is heavy upon the masculine sex, but she does not spare her own. True, we must not throw away our charms "on vain and insignificant men," who "fancy a well-adjusted Peruke is able to supply the want of brains"; but for ourselves, too, let us take heed. "For shame; let's abandon that old and therefore, one would think, unfashionable employment of pursuing butterflies and trifles." The gist of her complaint is that women's inferiority is due to her wretched education. She harks back wistfully to the hopes of the earlier Humanism, and quotes approvingly "Mr Wotton's Reflections on Antient and Modern Learning" where he writes of the days when learning "was so very modish that the fair sex seemed to believe that Greek and Latin added to their charms. . . . One would think by the effects that it was a proper way of educating them, since there are no accounts in history of so many great women in any one age, as are to be found between the years 15 and 1600." Her claims are modest enough—but where shall you find a more delicate example of the "thin end of the wedge"

than here? "We pretend not that women should teach in the Church" (perhaps a hit at the Quakers whom Evelyn about this time characterises as a "wild and fanatical" sect), "or usurp authority where it is not allow'd them" (not allow'd!); "permit us only to understand our own duty, and not to be forc'd to take it upon trust from others."

A valiant contemporary effort to improve women's education was made in France by Madame de Maintenon at St Cyr. The education at St Cyr began with generous ideals, but soon fell back to the conventual type. The point of interest is that Madame de Maintenon set out to train primarily not nuns, but wives and mothers; and amidst her labours was moved to an expression of despair, which the proposals of the present book are a belated endeavour to alleviate. "*Ce qui me manque le plus*," said she, "*ce sont de gendres!*" [1]

As was said above, the family method of education which was characteristic of Chivalry continued to be followed certainly for boys and to some extent still for girls in Tudor times. But at this period the schools began to be more resorted to than before by the nobility. It is perhaps not fanciful to connect the change with the depression of noble families which was carried out as a definite policy by the Tudor kings. When Chivalry declined still further under the Stuarts, the nobility were yet loth to transfer their children from the castle to the school. Mr Ponsonby,

[1] Compayré, "Histoire de la Pédagogie," 188.

writing of this period (in "The Decline of Aristocracy," p. 39), says: "Sons of the gentry were taken into the households of lords and county magnates, as scholars, pages or companions, where they learned something of the high life of the period, its bad as well as its good side. The younger sons of the aristocracy were taught by the chaplain . . . the eldest son was rarely sent to school or university. After a course of legal training to prepare him for the duties of justice of the peace, he would finish his education by travelling abroad with a tutor. . . ." In a play of Ben Jonson's, published in 1631, there is an interesting discussion on the relative merits of the old method and the newer Public School, where the advantages of a chivalric education are thus described:

> "the noblest way
> Of breeding up our youth, in letters, arms,
> Fair mien, discourses, civil exercise
> And all the blazon of a gentleman.
> Where can he learn to vault, to ride, to fence,
> To move his body gracefuller, to speak
> His language purer, or to tune his mind
> Or manners more to the harmony of nature
> Than in these nurseries of nobility?"[1]

Towards the end of the same century trenchant criticism of the schools comes from the pen of John Locke. He writes of the folly of hazarding "your son's innocence and virtue for a little Greek and Latin." Again he says: "How anyone's being put into a mixed herd of unruly boys, and there learning to

[1] *The New Inn, or The Light Heart*, a Comedy, Act I., scene 1.

wrangle at a trap, or rook (= cheat, as it still does) at span-farthing, fits him for civil conversation or business, I do not see. . . . Vice, if we may believe the general complaint, ripens so fast nowadays and runs up to seed so early in young people, that it is impossible to keep a lad from the spreading contagion, if you will venture him abroad in the world" ("Thoughts Concerning Education," published 1693). It is evident that Locke feared dangers similar to those which in the previous century had moved Erasmus to criticism. He remarks more than once that he thinks the sister educated at home better off than her brother at school.

Most writers on the question are inclined to agree that the period extending from the Restoration to the middle of the eighteenth century marks for England the nadir in women's progress. The division, which the Church had made in an earlier age—not always with complete justification—between the life of virtue and the life of the world, came for women at least of the upper classes to represent the real facts of the situation. The qualities which bought success for them in high places were of a showy and superficial kind; and the alternative to this tinsel glory was a seclusion worse in its dull lifelessness than the actual oppression of walls and bars. Education for women spelt proficiency in accomplishments, by which was meant mainly the art of passing time without accomplishing anything. Not that the age was destitute of ideals, even of womanhood; for when society misses the reality of virtue it yet, as Plato

long ago recognised, takes to itself the decent cloak of convention. But the idealisation of womanhood ran riot in a slough of mawkish sentimentality, as it is apt to do when the life of the sexes is to any extent artificially separated whether in school or in the larger world. Women were tender and graceful plants in the garden of a man's pleasure ; if they were to be cultivated at all, it was that they might the more effectually attract his fancy and satisfy his whims. In such an atmosphere the elegant cynicism of my Lord Chesterfield was but a natural growth ; and he might well advise his son thus upon the subject of women : " . . . a seeming regard for their understandings, a seeming desire of and deference for their advice, together with a seeming confidence in their moral virtues, turns their heads intirely in your favour." And Lady Mary Montagu might well warn her sex to hide their light beneath a bushel, when she could write of " the proposal of a learned education for daughters, which the generality of men believe as great a profanation, as the clergy would if the laity should presume to exercise the functions of the priesthood."

Throughout the century indeed there are signs that men were recollecting that women had minds as well as bodies ; and the agitation for a rational education slowly gathered force. There came an era of blue-stockings, such as Mrs Thrale and Fanny Burney and, later, Hannah More ; and boarding schools for young ladies grew apace in the land. Again, the ideas of the French Revolution, unwelcome as they were

to the conservatism of the upper classes, introduced a disturbing factor, and through the life and writings of Mary Wollstonecraft the Woman's Movement was drawn into the current of democratic advance.

Of actual schooling there was not overmuch for the young of either sex even in the highest classes. It was still common for young aristocrats to pass from the care of a sedentary tutor in the library to that of an itinerant tutor on the Continent. Nothing perhaps is more significant of the measure in which, where education was valued at all, it was assumed to take place in the home, than the fact that Daniel Defoe's "Family Instructor," a manual on the upbringing of children, which went through a score or so of editions in the course of the century, contains no reference to school. The young lady in that entertaining work, who kicks over the traces at home,[1] is packed off, not to school, but to an aunt's—"a sober, religious family"—and in due course marries her cousin—"a sober, religious gentleman."

It is probable that among the yeomen and middle class women attained a more truly honourable and respected position than at a higher level in the social scale. But the coming of the Industrial Revolution went far to change all that; women were driven from the household industries into the field of open competition with men, and the whole question of their place in the social system began to come to the fore, although long years elapsed between the recognition

[1] "... was past a child; she would go to the park and to the play, and the like, ay, that she would!"

of the problem and the first practical steps towards its solution.

With Mary Wollstonecraft's views we shall have more dealings in the next chapter; but may note here one point in her discussion of educational problems, which is of particular interest in the argument for Co-education—a point, moreover, which was a frequent theme with other writers about that time—namely, the recognition that both home and (under the "separate" system) school education have their attendant evils. Writing in 1792, "The only way," she says, "to avoid two extremes equally injurious to morality would be to contrive some way of combining a public and private education." [1]

This view is echoed by William Godwin writing five years later: "The objections to both the modes of education here discussed are of great magnitude. It is unavoidable to inquire whether a middle way might not be selected, neither entirely public nor entirely private, avoiding the mischiefs of each and embracing the advantages of both." [2] In 1810 Sidney Smith discussed in *The Edinburgh Review* the problems both of "Female Education" and of the Public School. In regard to girls he accepts the view then becoming common among reformers that the mental differences of sex are largely due to differences in the methods of education. "If you catch up one half of these creatures and train them to a particular set of actions and opinions, and the other half to a

[1] "Vindication of the Rights of Women," Chapter XII.
[2] *The Inquirer*, 1797, Essay VII.

perfectly opposite set, of course their understandings will differ, as one or the other sort of occupations has called this or that talent into action." He criticises severely the Public Schools on the ground of their excessive numbers (in proportion to staff), and the evils which arise in them from the unrestrained authority of older boys. He condemns their bad influence on morals, and will have no truck with the " wild-oats " theory, which was apparently put forward in sanction of licence. And he concludes : " We have no hesitation, however, in saying that that education seems to us to be the best, which mingles a domestic with a school life." All these writers advocated day schools, and Mary Wollstonecraft at least desired also a full measure of Co-education. The advantage of this addition is that it serves to solve the moral problem in boarding schools as well as day schools, and the boarding school system, we have been told, " is deeply ingrained in English educational traditions."

We need not here trace the development of girls' education in the nineteenth century ; and with the changes which the times have wrought in the Public School we have in a measure dealt already. But it will be useful to gather up in conclusion a few of the threads which have intertwined in the straggling relation of the foregoing pages.

At no period since history began has the actual relation between the sexes more than dimly mirrored the ideal. But the relative success of the reflection has

still served as an index of the general progress of civilisation ; and more especially the part which the family and family ideals have played in the social system has determined in great measure the quality of social life in particular times and places. To what extent the solidarity and persistence of the Jews are to be attributed to the purity of family life, or to other causes, is hard to determine. But it is not easy to believe the persistence possible without this powerful contributing cause. We have suggested that to the entire absence of this factor in the civilisation of classical Greece is to be assigned in some part at least its rapid decay. The idealisation of the Roman matron was a practice deeply inwoven with the religious faith of the early Roman ; but the appeal of that faith itself was not strong enough to endure through the perilous transition from city-state to Empire, and the corroding influence of a decadent Orientalism. We saw how the Church for long bound itself in fetters of its own fashioning ; and how its contradictory attitude helped — unwittingly, no doubt—to kill by spiritual starvation that promise of a more complete ideal which seemed to rise from the Chivalry of northern races ; how Humanism too stumbled against the same barrier, and how the division between Church and World gave birth to those unnatural extremes of Puritanism and gallantry, the clash of which was merged in the confusion of the Revolutionary epoch. And now the same problems are passed on to our day, rendered more intricate by the intrusion of questions of economic and political

right, but with the burden lightened too by hopes which spring from fuller knowledge and more generous ideals.

Throughout the period under review there has prevailed generally a maladjustment of sex relations, expressing itself in various ways, and working always incalculable harm—the more so in that the effects are not always seen, acting, as they do, rather as a hidden drag upon the wheels of progress, than as an obstacle standing visibly in the way. This failure has impressed itself upon our social system and our moral ideals. By its influence as embodied in the attitude of the Church it has affected the whole course of education, tending to the establishment of a masculine monopoly and a monastic method. When the former was broken down the latter remained to perpetuate the fears which helped to produce it. Yet, as we have also seen, there has always been an undercurrent of conviction, materialising in occasional practice, that the monastic system with its obvious limitations does not represent the ideal. There has been a feeling among men that in the institution of the family are influences, whose exchange for the larger life of the school is but a doubtful gain. In the chivalric training of the feudal castles this feeling doubtless found some satisfaction ; and in many humbler homes of later centuries children were brought up in the wholesome fear of God—combined too often with a most unwholesome ignorance of His world.

To unite the purity and naturalness of home life with a larger experience and more varied influences

—this is a task which education finds it difficult to fulfil in the midst of a society which in principle and practice accepts a standard of morality in matters of sex far below that which is set by the home. Yet there are signs that we are coming to render something more than lip-service to the ideals of the home ; and in proportion as the larger life of society draws the individual ever more and more into a wider range of social relationships, and this reacts, as in a measure it must, upon the exclusiveness of domestic ties—just so far it becomes vitally important that this larger life should adopt and follow those higher ideals which have developed in the intensive culture of a narrower circle. Yet we still cling in our social practice—and therefore in our educational systems—to mistaken and half-hearted ideals of the past. That radical change in that quarter is an essential preliminary to reform is surely a self-evident proposition. But that to train the sexes apart is the right way to teach them how to live together is a suggestion at which our reason boggles; and one, moreover, which experience, as it seems to us, emphatically contradicts.

CHAPTER V

THE WOMAN'S MOVEMENT

"Can anything, for example, be more perfectly absurd than to suppose that the care and perpetual solicitude which a mother feels for her children depends upon her ignorance of Greek and Mathematics, and that she would desert an infant for a quadratic equation?"—SIDNEY SMITH, 1810.

"A woman may be acquainted with Greek and the Higher Mathematics, and be as uneducated in the wider relationships of life as a man in the like case."—HAVELOCK ELLIS, 1911.

THOSE, who attempt to understand or to expound the rights or the duties of the individual in his social relations, are driven by the vagueness and complexity of their data to an abstractness of treatment which endangers the validity of their judgment. The peril of abstraction lies in the difficulty of complete generalisation; in the tendency to abstract certain features for consideration and to ignore others. Anyone can make a syllogism who picks his premisses. And to this danger they are especially liable who turn their attention to the legal or economic aspects of social relationships. The keen jurist will confuse the legal with the moral; would-be social reformers often mistake the legal for the actual; while in the sphere of economics a useful lesson may be drawn from the history of the "economic man," that unsubstantial ghost, who served very well as an illustration, but

collapsed ignominiously when he tried to shoulder the weight of a science. That the philosophy of the Woman's Movement has not escaped this danger is a contention which most impartial thinkers will admit.

If the ultimate aim of that movement is right, we are inclined to think that it is so quite independently of the logic with which it is often supported. It may seem unfair to take Mary Wollstonecraft's theories as an example, since she is distant from us by more than a century. But the logic of many a modern argument derives directly from her; and the passion which so often obscures the argument may be considered as an echo, with the reverberations of a century behind it, of that life which was too full of passion.

Read in the light of eighteenth-century history, and in connection with the position at which women had arrived in that period, the "Vindication of the Rights of Woman" needs little justification for its extravagance. But to explain a view by a reference to the circumstances of its origin is not to vindicate it in its entirety; and while there is much in Mary Wollstonecraft's practical conclusions—as, for example, her enthusiastic advocacy of Co-education—with which we wholly agree, at the same time it seems to us that her philosophy of sex is vitiated by what after all is a fallacy. Seeing, as she did, how much of what was evil both in the position of women and in the general state of society was due to the existence of a sex distinction, Mary Wollstonecraft desired, if such a thing were possible, to abolish that distinction by a few strokes of the pen. "I do honestly wish," she wrote, "to see

the distinction of sex confounded in society, unless where love animates the behaviour. For this distinction is, I am firmly persuaded, the foundation of the weakness of character ascribed to woman. . . ." A truer logic might have helped her to see that the evil lay not in the distinction established by God, but in the misuse thereof by men and women. The kind of reasoning which would minimise sex differences is really based on a false and unphilosophical view of equality. Since the superiority of men over women was plainly expressed in legal and economic privilege, it seemed that to abolish this privilege was to make women equal to men ; and it seemed too that the way to effect this was to belittle the differences of sex, and to emphasise the humanity common to both sexes ; which in practice resulted in an attempt to make woman as like man as possible.

But there is something superficial about this line of argument. The truth is that to regard woman as a human being does not really place her higher than she stands as a woman. The true basis of individual rights is the unique value of personality. But this means that the claim of the individual to the consideration of his fellows is founded, not on that which he has in common with them, but rather on that which he has, or is, apart from them. It is true that this is a rule which would still apply if the sex distinction were abolished. But the distinction of sex is not one which can be abolished or ignored. It is indeed so important a factor that, once admitted to consideration, it supersedes, as it were, the factor of

common humanity. For the claim of one sex to the consideration of the other is seen to rest not on the denial but on the affirmation of the sex distinction and the value of each sex to the other. The rights of a woman are in fact not dissociable from her sex. And it is hard to see how Mary Wollstonecraft's view of woman differs materially from that which she found prevalent—the view of woman as an inferior kind of man. She denied the inferiority indeed ; but she did so by denying the difference. She sought to establish the equality of men and women by proving they are the same, whereas their equality really rests on the fact that they are different.

We are far from denying that the abolition of legal and economic privilege is essential to the progress of women. Among the manifold injustices, which the unrestrained working of economic " laws " has inflicted on the human race, there is none harsher than its reaction upon the female sex in general. The use of the word " law " in this connection is often impugned, but it is sufficiently justified by broad facts of human nature. Given the predominance of certain motives and principles (largely of a selfish character) in the production and distribution of wealth by and among men, certain results will tend to follow. Among these results is the establishment of a false or at least inadequate standard of " value " ; so that many of the most truly valuable services fail to obtain any direct economic requital. One of these is the supreme service of motherhood. The labour of motherhood having in spite of its necessity no marketable value, women

are at a disadvantage in a society which is in bondage to the idols of the market-place. Both the fact of motherhood itself, and in some measure the possession of a physical constitution adapted to that service, handicap women still further in a competitive warfare which is waged upon the purely economic plane ; and so combine with other causes to produce the terrible social evils of sweating and its inevitable concomitant, prostitution.

If there was ever any doubt about this, it was settled by the publication of John Stuart Mill's " Subjection of Women," which established once and for all the connection between the legal and economic subjection and the actual miseries of women. We need not rehearse the argument ; and although much has been done, since the publication of that work, no one will deny that much still remains to be effected in the removal of artificial burdens from women's shoulders. But the point we wish to make is that it is possible to grant all this, and yet hold that the evils in question will not be remedied by the mere removal of restrictions. The social sore has a deeper root ; and Leviathan sick is not to be cured by the application of legislative ointment. Mr Havelock Ellis has written of women's suffrage that it " no more means a new heaven or even a new earth, than it means, as other people fear, a new purgatory and a new hell. . . . It is merely an act of justice and a reasonable condition of social hygiene." [1] And much the same kind of criticism applies to all proposals to improve by

[1] " The Task of Social Hygiene," p. 85.

external means the social position of women. In the first place there are great practical difficulties in the way of altering an economic system, which will not be avoided by pretending that people may be moved about in mechanical fashion, like pawns on a chess-board. There are also incidental possibilities such as that the placing of men and women on a footing of economic equality may lead to an increase in that undesirable sex competition which industrial evolution seems *quand même* to be bringing in its train.

This question of competition brings us back again to what we have suggested is the prevailing bias of the Woman's Movement. Competition is, as it seems to us, the dominating note of that movement. The movement itself has many aspects : there is a natural desire to vindicate the fitness of women to compete with men in every field of social activity ; there is condemnation of a system which tends to deny to a woman, if unmarried, a complete life of her own, and to restrict her, when married, to the home ; there is an ambition to share equally with men in the government of the state and the work of the professions ; and there is, of course, a claim to equal participation in all the advantages of education. The very justice of these claims itself accentuates the note of competition. The old idea arises that equality means sameness or similarity. We are told for example that there is no such thing as a "female mind"[1] ; and,

[1] "There is no female mind. The brain is not an organ of sex. As well speak of the female liver."—C. P. Gilman, "Women and Economics," p. 149.

generally speaking, sex differences are minimised and there is a tendency to approximate as much as possible to the masculine, as the more advantageously placed type. That this tendency is not unrecognised within the movement is suggested by the prominence in feminist philosophy of a point of view which contains an implicit defence of it. We are told that the long prevalence of the degrading "sexuo-economic" relation has led to an exaggeration of the sex element in the human animal: that we are now, in fact, "oversexed," and that the apparent differences between men and women are to a large extent artificial and the product of custom.

Modern feminism in effect suffers from a distorted sense of proportion. It would seem that the continual focusing of attention on certain aspects of the sex relation has induced in many women (and some men) an exaggerated view of male supremacy; the economic and political lordship of men is interpreted as conscious oppression; while the corresponding subservience of women is held to be synonymous with a servile degradation. As Mona Lisa is supposed to portray in the moulding of her features and the mystery of her smile the accumulated wisdom of past ages, so to-day there is a sort of women whose manner suggests that they have taken upon their shoulders all the sorrows real and imagined of their sisters of every century and clime, to visit the sin thereof on the head of the modern man. Who does not know that smile of mingled charity and contempt, which seems ever to remind him of ages of oppression

for which he feels no guilt, while it extends to him a Christian forgiveness, which strikes him, under the circumstances, as singularly superfluous? When the contempt is in excess of the charity—as it sometimes is—there are tangible results in broken windows and a disturbed postal service.

Co-educationists should be the last to forget that it is that moral evil, against which they are so earnestly directing their efforts, which is the real if unpublished cause for the exasperation of feeling which results in militancy. To seem compelled to stand by powerless, whilst men in accomplishing their own degradation drag down womanhood also into the mire and then visit upon them, as far as public recognition goes, the consequences of sin—this is an injustice which explains, if it does not justify, the fiercest methods of retaliation; yet it is doubtful whether militancy is really very effective as a weapon against economic or political injustice. And if the wrongs of women are to be traced to causes which lie deeper still, the ineffectiveness of this method of attack is certain. We suggested in the last chapter that the maladjustment of sex relations is at bottom an ethical question, although, of course, it has its economic and political reactions. If this is so, we cannot believe that any amount of legislative interference with political or economic conditions will really go to the root of the matter. Unless, while we are carrying out these superficial changes (however important in themselves), we work at the same time towards such a conception of sex relationship

as shall relegate them to the limbo of comparative insignificance, we shall jump from the frying-pan; not perhaps into the fire, but back into the frying-pan again. And that is a poor method of progression.

Meanwhile the spread of exaggerated ideas about masculine tyranny, and the effort to uproot it by securing a share in those privileges which are the supposed weapons of the despot, have roused opposition, not in those alone who on principle support the thing established, but in many also who are sincerely desirous of raising the status of women. The recent advance of biology and psychology has turned the attention of the scientific inquirer to the psychical differences of sex. Mental and moral distinctions, which were previously not unrecognised indeed, but vaguely apprehended and inarticulately expressed, have been honoured with scientific definition, and have thus entered the field of reasoned discussion. The natural strength of vague but deep-rooted beliefs, reinforced by the weapons of science, has created a movement unsympathetic or even directly hostile to the struggle for sex " equality."

From this side it is urged that the feminist movement is a violation of Nature. We are told that progress in general means increasing differentiation of form and function, and that to oppose this natural order of things is to invite disaster. A typical exposition of this point of view is that of Mr Lionel Tayler in his " Nature of Woman," where the biological significance of sex is set forth with a wealth of scientific argument, couched in that language, so

much more curious than beautiful, to which the literary scientist is unaccountably attached. Mr Tayler has nothing but scorn for "dewomanising emancipationists." On the one hand, he denies all meaning to the term "over-sexed" as applied to our present condition. On the other hand, he will have none of that ideal of the "neuter sex" which he finds offered him as an alternative.

To Mr Tayler, as a scientist, the path of righteousness is to follow in the footsteps of Nature. The primary question is not, What shall we do ?—but, What is Nature doing ? At least the solution of the first question depends upon the answer given to the second. The conflict between cosmic and moral, which perplexed the mind of Huxley, has apparently no terrors for the later scientist. The thing which is—that is the thing which ought to be. To him the present relations between the sexes are the natural and proper result of sex evolution. To most of us "cosmic" and human evolution are sadly different things. This is not Mr Tayler's view. The "sexuo-economic" dependence of women, which Mrs Gilman or Miss Hamilton regard as the work of man, to him appears as an ordinance of Nature. Women are passive, quiescent, contemplative ; men are active, energetic and inventive. The gentler part, which woman has been ordained to play, is for her also the better part. For therein lies the secret of that tender grace and mild influence, which surround the life of the home and proceed thence to illumine the path of civilisation and smooth the rough places of the world.

Again, intellectual activities are the business of men ; the mind of a woman works rather, or ought to work, were it not for "woman's dewomanising education," through feeling and appreciation. Therefore, says Mr Tayler in effect, unless we are to throw away the riches which Nature showers upon us through the channels of an ever-increasing differentiation, we must not hinder indeed, but rather develop to the full such differences as we find. Above all, we must not endanger by false educational ideals the angelic quality of perfect womanhood. Mr Tayler is so conversant with Nature that he not only reads her lessons, but perceives the practical application of them with a rapidity of intuition which is almost feminine. In the following paragraph, for example, the "and therefore" seems to us a very small bridge across a not inconsiderable gulf :—

"The history of the race and of the child alike point to the conclusion that mental and bodily sex individuality is of progressive importance in human evolution, *and therefore*, after the childhood period is passed, biology cannot favour *co-educational* or co-occupational systems of social life."

In other quarters of his book this argument, it is true, receives some amplification. He connects Co-education (quite wrongly) with the "neuter sex idea," which, he says, "should form the basis of a logical thought about Co-education, for if Co-education means what its name implies, it assumes that the girl

and boy are so alike in bodily and mental characteristics during pubescence and adolescence that they can receive a similar education. . . . The aim of all (*i.e.* Co-education and other heresies), whether consciously or unconsciously, is to dewomanise the woman and destroy her real inborn individuality of body and mind." Of the period of adolescence he says: "The danger to both sexes alike is a false sentimentalism, which must, none the less, not make us blind to the fact that this period should be marked by a development of real sentiment, of genuine respect for women and for men, of love of truth, beauty and religion. If the minds of the boy and girl were the same, it might be conceivable that their education should be similar, but, etc. . . . The case for Co-education, I confess, seems to me quite unbiological, though I am ready to change this opinion if the evidence is forthcoming. It seems to depend for its influence on some rather dogmatic assertions of its value by co-educationists, which are not submitted to examination, and to the fact that it is cheap—a bad argument ; and that classes are easier to manage —which is, if possible, a worse. The easy way in almost all pursuits is easy by avoiding, not overcoming, difficulties."

We hope that these objections will be more fully answered in the positive exposition of co-educational principles which follows in later chapters. But we should like here to make a few comments. Co-education, as we understand and have seen it, has nothing whatever to do with "dewomanisation."

The cultivation of " real sentiment," etc., is one of the main aims of the system and cannot easily be obtained in any other way. The " dogmatic assertions " Mr Tayler complains of are dogmatic because based on experience, which enhances, not diminishes, their value : they are, moreover, open to any kind of examination Mr Tayler may suggest. We agree that " cheapness " is a bad argument, and we do not employ it. But we fail to see any vice in easily obtained discipline. Does Mr Tayler really think it is better for boys and girls to be in a state of suppressed indiscipline, which only an iron hand prevents from eruption, than to fall into a habit of discipline of their own sweet will ? If so, we can only say we await with eagerness a fuller exposition of Mr Tayler's educational philosophy. That there is something morally bracing about the process of setting up obstacles in order to knock them down seems to us to be an argument standing upon a somewhat insecure basis.

In considering Mr Tayler's views as a whole, we are bound to admit that there is some justification for the protest which he and his school of thought make against the extreme tendencies of feminism. But if the feminist movement goes too far in ignoring sex differences, so the pendulum of Mr Tayler's thought swings, as it seems to us, too far in the opposite direction. He seems to accept contentedly the apparent trend of sex evolution in the direction of increasing differentiation, without any adequate consideration of its value for human purposes or the best method of making use of it. We are far from complaining of

his advice to accept the lead of Nature by avoiding interference with it. That is an important part of the case for Co-education. It is in the practical application of his philosophy that we come across what appear to us to be its limitations. It is a little curious that so devout a follower of the goddess Nature should yet form so exaggerated an estimate of man's power to alter her decrees. Nothing indeed is more amazing than the extent to which not only Mr Tayler, but many critics of Co-education, think it possible for education to affect sex differences. That education may modify those differences in certain directions we are far from denying. It is indeed a part of our case. But that to educate boys and girls together is to endanger the persistence of the fundamental psychical differences of sex, in the way which some people imagine possible, is a view we are altogether at a loss to understand. The claim for equal or similar education for the two sexes need not involve any disregard of genuine sex differences, or postulate a doctrine of complete mental parallelism. Indian meal is an excellent food both for pigs and for poultry; by aid of this identical diet pigs grow bacon while poultry lay eggs; and the breakfast-tables of the world are enriched by the differentiation. But he who would justify this method of feeding is under no necessity to obscure the essential distinction of pigs and poultry. It suffices him to point to the results and to applaud the subtlety of Nature. The analogy is admittedly limited: education is not mere mental feeding; but, however great may be its power, it

certainly stops short of effecting an exchange between the mental characteristics of boys and girls. One might as reasonably expect it to effect an exchange of their physical constitutions.

The truth about these two extreme schools of thought seems to be that they have hit upon the same dilemma, and have each appropriated a single horn thereof. One of the facts about women is that some of them marry and some of them do not; in this country at least celibacy is compulsory for many women, because of their preponderating numbers compared with the other sex. Now as all education must have its utilitarian side, there is clearly some uncertainty about the education of girls. Shall they be educated chiefly for marriage and motherhood, or for celibacy and economic independence? The feminists concentrate on the second alternative, their opponents on the first. The former have regard to the fact that many women must earn their own living, while they generally add the corollary that all women, married or not, have an individuality to develop, which is independent of their sexual life. But in vindicating the ability of girls to work together with boys they tend to exaggerate their mental similarities,[1] and in pressing the claims of women to share equally with men in the work of the world they assume too

[1] See "Notebooks of Samuel Butler," p. 226: "If you choose to insist on the analogies and points of resemblance between men and women, they are so great that the differences seem small indeed. If, on the other hand, you are in a mood for emphasising the points of difference, you can show that men and women have hardly anything in common."

readily that equality means doing the same work in the same way. The latter, observing that most women are still destined to marry, would impart a domestic bias to the education of every girl ; and in their concentration on the training for that future home-life, which will be the lot of the majority, they overestimate the degree of specialisation which is necessary for this end, and represent it as much less compatible with ordinary school *curricula* than it actually is ; while the ideal of future life, which they would put before the schoolgirl, involves much more restriction to the domestic circle than is essential to domestic happiness or efficiency.

Now it seems to us that the truth lies neither at the one extreme nor at the other. Doubtless it is important that girls who must earn their living should know how to do so ; it is important too that future wives and mothers should be more acquainted with the duties of their state than they often are. But it is essential in either case that men and women should come to know and to appreciate each other better, and to make fuller use of each other, whether they be partners in marriage or in the work of the world. If there is anything significant for us, as thinking and self-willing beings, in the natural evolution of sex towards increasing differentiation, it is surely intended that we should make use of it for mutual enrichment.

If the distinction of sex has any purpose in human evolution beyond the purely animal—and we are not of that company who hold that evolution is altogether

non-moral—then the relation between the sexes cannot be ignored in any view of ideal development. No doubt women have a part to play in the society of the future which will take them beyond the circle of the home. But whether the point of view be that of self-realisation or of service, the relation in which women stand to the other sex will still determine both the quality of their ideals and the measure of their attainment. If, as the prophets say, the exigencies of a developing social life will encroach more and more upon the exclusiveness of the home, and draw out the energies of both men and women to activities of even wider range, it is the more important on that account that men and women should find and establish an ideal of sex relationship. The records of history may tell us of countless evils arising out of that relationship ; but they show us no less how much that is best and noblest in human achievement is to be traced to the same source. It has indeed often been noted as a characteristic of man's progress under the conditions of free will, that both the basest and the highest in human conduct may be attained by the use or misuse of the same qualities, endowments or passions. Whether it shall be use or misuse in the case of any one individual depends very much upon his or her—education.

It is an old commonplace that the provision of right surroundings is a first requisite in education. This is so because personality grows and develops through expansion, and is dependent for its growth on the quality of its environment. The most important

element in environment is the human element—the other people. Virtue, as Aristotle long ago recognised, is almost wholly a matter of social relations. What he perhaps did not grasp so clearly is the extent to which the formation of virtue depends upon the influence of other people. Now sex as a possible sphere of virtue and vice alike takes up a large space in human nature. It is vastly important both in mental and in moral growth, and, as we are beginning to recognise, it stands in as much need of proper training and guidance as any other department of the growing life. But sex, of course, is no abstract thing. It is embodied in persons ; and it is even more true of the virtue which centres upon sex than of others that it must be inculcated not as an abstraction but with reference to persons. In other words, the ideal of purity involves both self-respect and a right attitude to persons of the opposite sex.

And by a right attitude is meant more than the somewhat negative ideal which is generally accepted as sufficient. For chastity after all *is* a negative thing, and falls far short of the complete ideal of sex relationship. In this matter, as in other departments of morality, we want more emphasis on the positive and active side of goodness. Negative ideals may save us from slipping backwards into hell, but are not likely to propel us very far forward on the road to heaven. The moral significance of the sex distinction surely amounts to something more than the provision of temptations to evil which are to be overcome. The differentiation is meant to be put to more positive

moral use. The basis of sex attraction is manifestly not physical alone, but psychical; the need of one sex for the other indicates that there is something complementary in their natures. And this of course does not apply to love alone. There are kinds and degrees in sex relations, and a wide range where the question of love leading to marriage does not enter. The whole question of the relations of women to men is confused and difficult, and mankind is but slowly groping its way to a dimly seen ideal. But some things emerge clearly enough: as that the future holds vistas of fuller, wiser and more fruitful co-operation between men and women, and of a greater use by either sex of the special gifts of the other. There are visions of self-realisation which must remain for ever unfulfilled, if the mystical and spiritual values which sex brings into human life continue to be hampered or destroyed by perverted social arrangements and false ideals of sex relationship.

Social evolution involves, among other things, the substitution for a habit of "somehow muddling through," of a policy of conscious direction and control. We are beginning to realise that to follow Nature does not necessarily mean to wait upon events. If therefore our dreams of a happier relation between men and women are ever to materialise, the question must clearly receive deliberate consideration and definite treatment. Now Co-education does make real and far-reaching claims to deal with this question; not of course to solve it once and for all, but to make a

beginning, and to make that beginning in the only way in which great changes in social habits can be initiated—through the children. The future is more plastic to our hands than the present, because youth is impressionable; and the boys and girls of to-day form the society of to-morrow. The period of growth is also the time for training; and in no sphere of human nature and conduct is this so true as in all that relates to sex. Although the claims of Co-education may not be granted *a priori*, this much at least is evident: that the proper treatment of sex, whether in the home or in the school, is a duty which has been widely neglected. And, as we have endeavoured to show, the "separate" system which is prevalent in this country to-day cannot be taken to embody conclusions deliberately arrived at after discussion and experiment. It is a haphazard growth; and though much care and thought have been expended upon developing it in various directions, sometimes right and sometimes wrong, there has been little direct reference to what may well be regarded as the central problem of adolescent life. Arguments designed to support it from this point of view have been rather by way of afterthought, and, as might be expected, are largely theoretical, and lose in value through lack of comparative criticism based on experience of the other system.

But Co-education does definitely attempt to deal with this central problem, and merits accordingly more and closer attention than it has yet received at the hands both of social reformers and of

educationists. For education cannot really be dissociated from social reform. Whether the interest of the social reformer centre in the reform of society as a whole and the improvement of social relations, or in the development of the individual; whether he consider first the evil result to society of badly adjusted sex relationships, or the importance of sex in individual growth—in either case, the question whether the separate or the co-educational system be the better is a vital and fundamental question.

At no time has the education of boys been much influenced by consideration as to the right place of sex in development and its proper treatment from that point of view. It may be argued, and of course there is some scientific basis for the contention, that sex is in a sense less pervasive—more incidental—in the male than in the female; but it is also more insistent, and may become pervasive enough in quite undesirable ways, if neglected. And, if sex is by no means safely negligible in the case of the boy, it is certainly still less so in the girl. Yet, in many ways which are not unimportant, it seems to us that the movement for women's education in the last century has neglected to consider this fact. At any rate the principles and practice of female education at the present day fall far short in our view of the ideal demanded by a philosophic theory of sex relationship.

The whole trend of the Woman's Movement has been vitiated in its origin and growth by the preponderating influence of the economic factor. The Industrial Revolution altered profoundly the economic

aspect of social life and drew women from the security of the home and household industries into the *Sturm und Drang* of economic warfare, while the French Revolution, with its doctrines of abstract equality, combined with these industrial changes to obscure sex distinctions and lure women to the false ideal of competition on equal and identical terms with men. The movement for women's education therefore followed the lines of pre-existing masculine institutions, and aimed primarily at an intellectual ideal. But, as Havelock Ellis aptly writes, " A woman may be acquainted with Greek and the Higher Mathematics, and be as uneducated in the wider relationships of life as a man in the like case." [1] The danger of this ideal lies in its incompleteness. And it will be the more and not the less dangerous in the future from the fact that the trend of civilisation would seem to involve increased demands upon the feminine intellect. On the economic side there is the growing supersession of mere manual labour by directive ability, which at least cancels the feminine disadvantage of physical inferiority ; while in government the development of humanitarian tendencies will undoubtedly open up new fields of service for women ; and the possible socialisation of much of our present household drudgery, with the consequent saving of labour, should set free much feminine energy for cultural or practical expression. Moreover—though we do not wish to fall into the easy but not very critical habit of exaggerating the growth of materialism

[1] " The Task of Social Hygiene," p. 57.

—there are signs, clear enough in America, and not wanting in England, that increasing commercialism and professionalism among men are endangering the persistence of "the humanities." The tendency in America, which Americans sometimes deplore, of the higher culture to fall under the guidance of women, seems to us, when we consider that the alternative is possibly its extinction, to be a blessing disguised only by those who receive it. The mission of women in education may be of wider range than we yet dream. But it cannot be a mission to women alone. Neither is the preservation of culture alone the ideal of education. The expansion of women's activities along cultural and practical lines alike should have a close reference to their relations with men. For whether we agree with Charlotte Gilman that woman's future sphere will lie ever less in the home, or share with Professor Stanley Hall an interpretation of female evolution which centres still upon the hearth,[1] we are driven to believe that men and women in the future must needs live more for and through each other than in the past. As Samuel Butler wrote in language simple but true, "It is the delight of either sex to understand the other as fully as it can, and those who succeed most in this respect are the best and happiest, whether men or women." [2]

A feeling that there is much in the modern education of women which does not make for the best development of womanhood is at the root of such

[1] See Chapter VII.

[2] "Notebooks," p. 105.

movements as those which are associated with writers like Lionel Tayler in England and Stanley Hall in America. But it seems to us that in viewing the question too exclusively from the standpoint of wifehood and motherhood, and, further, in emphasising the importance of the latter of these so much more than the former, these writers restrict the range of sex influence and diminish the value of their own proposals ; for they single out one aspect of womanhood and concentrate on that to the exclusion of others, with the result that their visions have little practical value in a world where women are wives as well as mothers ; and not only that, but friends, colleagues and helpers of men in every sphere of life. An education which should concentrate on motherhood alone might well defeat its own ends ; it might improve the physical while depressing the psychical quality of a race [1] ; it would resemble many of the

[1] A German writer, reviewing the state of women's education in the various countries of Europe a hundred years ago, praised the Dutch nation (as contrasted with the Romance nations) for educating their women entirely for motherhood, but added an interesting reflection: "The Dutch women accomplish a more essential portion of the purposes of female existence ; and yet their occupations and pleasures are far from embracing all that the sex, under favourable exterior circumstances, is capable of performing and enjoying."—C. Meiners, " History of the Female Sex," iv. 276, translated 1808.

Even from the purely eugenic standpoint the truth is not entirely on the side of the Stanley Hall school. For the probable eugenic effects of establishing the economic independence of women, and so restoring "sexual selection," see K. Pearson, " The Chances of Death, etc," i. 238 ; and A. R. Wallace, " Social Environment and Moral Progress," pp. 137-138.

proposals of the eugenists, which are unscientific just because they are too scientific : they are complete in themselves, but insufficiently related to the exigencies and possibilities of a rough-and-tumble world.

One reason why the Woman's Movement assumes on the whole a saner outlook in America than in England is that in the former country it is not an isolated tendency, but is bound up both in theory and in practice with the development of democracy, and is therefore a movement of women working with rather than against men. And unless the English movement can effect a similar union, it is not likely to achieve real success. But so long as the boys and girls of our educated and professional classes are brought up in cloistered seclusion, it is unreasonable to expect that the present divergence between men and women will be succeeded by harmonious co-operation. We are glad to note that so great an authority on questions of sex as Mr Havelock Ellis is of opinion that a " potent factor in bringing about a saner attitude " in the Woman's Movement " will be the education of boys and girls together."

These suggestions, given though they are in vague outline and standing in much need of development, serve nevertheless in our opinion to establish a sound *a priori* case for Co-education. That case is of course bristling with points for discussion. It is possible to argue that the mental differences between the sexes are such as to make their working together

impracticable; or that the attraction of sex, which is based on so deep-rooted an instinct, would be enhanced by closer contact, and the years of adolescence be disturbed by more storms and greater stress than are the inevitable accompaniment of that period under a policy of monastic seclusion. If these things were so, the confusion of our present situation might give place only to a deeper chaos. But another vision rises to our view—a vision based on the belief that the differences of sex, mental and moral, as well as physical, are not antagonistic but complementary; and that boys and girls can, under right conditions and wise guidance, work and live together for their mutual good. At any rate it is our conviction that without this hope there is little chance that the Woman's Movement will ever bring either women or men to any goal worth the attainment.

[NOTE.—Although there is much in Mary Wollstonecraft's point of view with which we disagree, there is one chapter in the "Vindication of the Rights of Woman" which seems to us quite prophetic in its foresight. From the chapter on "National Education" we cull the following extracts, as they are full of suggestions valuable not only to those who are inquiring about Co-education, but also to those who are engaged in working out its problems:—

"I still, however, think schools, as they are now regulated, the hotbeds of vice and folly, and the knowledge of human nature supposed to be attained there, merely cunning selfishness. . . . But on the

contrary when (children) are brought up at home, though they may pursue a plan of study in a more orderly manner than can be adopted, when near a fourth part of the year is actually spent in idleness, and as much more in regret and anticipation, yet they there acquire too high an opinion of their own importance, etc. . . . The only way to avoid two extremes, equally injurious to morality, would be to contrive some way of combining a public and private education. . . . I have already animadverted on the bad habits which females acquire when they are shut up together; and I think that the observation may fairly be extended to the other sex, till the natural inference is drawn which I have had in view throughout—that to improve both sexes they ought, not only in private families, but in public schools, to be educated together. . . . I will venture to predict that virtue will never prevail in society till the virtues of both sexes are founded on reason; and till the affections common to both are allowed to gain their due strength by the discharge of mutual duties. . . . Day schools, for particular ages, should be established by Government, in which boys and girls might be educated together. The school for the younger children, from five to nine years of age, ought to be absolutely free and open to all classes. . . . After the age of nine, girls and boys intended for domestic employments, or mechanical trades, ought to be removed to other schools, and receive instruction, in some measure appropriate to the destination of each individual, the two sexes being still together in the

morning, but in the afternoon the girls should attend a school where plain work, mantua-making, millinery, etc., would be their employment. The young people of superior abilities, or fortune, might now be taught, in another school, the dead or living languages, the elements of science, and continue the study of history and politics on a more extensive scale, which would not exclude polite literature. Girls and boys still together? I hear some readers ask: yes. And I should not fear any other consequence than that some early attachments might take place; which, whilst it had the best effect on the moral character of the young people, might not perfectly agree with the views of the parents. . . . In this plan of education, the constitution of boys would not be ruined by the early debaucheries, which now make men so selfish, or girls rendered weak and vain by indolence and frivolous pursuits. But I presuppose that such a degree of equality should be established between the sexes as would shut out gallantry and coquetry, yet allow friendship and love to temper the heart for the discharge of higher duties. These would be schools of morality—and, the happiness of man allowed to flow from the pure springs of duty and affection, what advances might not the human mind make?"
("Vindication of the Rights of Woman," Chapter XII., pp. 363-390. Third Edition, 1796.)

There is an interesting contemporary note on this chapter in the work of Meiners (see page 153, note):
"In no part of Miss Wollstonecraft's publication are

there such absurdities as in that where she proposes that boys and girls should be educated in the same schools" (*op. cit.* iv., p. 306). Unfortunately there are no reasons whatever given for this sweeping condemnation !]

CHAPTER VI

THE EXPERIENCE OF AMERICA

"C'est même là une des difficultés de la psychologie de l'adolescence, comme de toute psychologie : savoir démêler les éléments constitutifs et universels de toute âme adolescente, ceux par lesquels elle est semblable à elle-même en tout temps et en tout pays, et l'apport particulier des mœurs d'une époque, des coutumes d'une nation. Il n'en est pas moins certain qu'une étude attentive et pénétrante peut parvenir à atteindre, sous les masques divers dont la revêtent les formes changeantes des sociétés humaines, la nature vraie et immutable de l'adolescence."—COMPAYRÉ, "L'Adolescence," p. 188.

THE above observations of M. Compayré form a fitting introduction to a chapter the theme of which lends itself easily to an abuse of analogical reasoning. But the abuse is not always on one side. Those who are eager to attribute the good effects of Co-education in America to the peculiar social conditions of the country are apt to forget that its harmful effects may be explained by considerations equally local and particular. There is truth, of course, in both contentions, while the whole truth resides in neither. America is not England ; but boys and girls are boys and girls the world over, and an inquiry into American Co-education—with due allowance for the width of the Atlantic—is bound to yield results of value for us.

It is frequently asserted that Co-education in the United States is based entirely on an economical motive. The rapid growth of the nation and its dispersion over the new continent led to a policy of "hustle" in social organisation very different from the leisurely chaotic wastefulness characteristic of European progress. Who would build two schools where one might serve? Not your Uncle Sam, at all events. But the generalisation is too wide. Co-education in America is closely bound up with democracy.[1] The application of the doctrine of equality to women, which the Revolutionists in France sometimes allowed on paper, was in the department of education at least carried early into practice by the American. Girls as well as boys attended the "common" schools of the eighteenth century, and the State system which grew up in the nineteenth century naturally followed the arrangement with which the people were familiar. There was, it is true, a certain distinction between East and West. The older settlements of the East still clung tenaciously to traditions which had been brought over from the mother country; and there was some tendency to discriminate between boys and girls. But we are warned not to exaggerate the bearing of this tendency. "Discriminations of this kind in the East had nothing to do with the question of Co-education *per se*. They were due rather to the

[1] "To realise how deeply this policy is involved with the spread of democratic principles, we have only to recall the past history of education."—"Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1903," p. 1048.

conviction that nothing should be attempted by public authorities that can be left to private initiative, etc."[1] A sound English principle! As we shall see later, the East is not yet altogether in line with the West in this matter.

But we are not concerned with "elementary" Co-education, which is, moreover, almost universally admitted both in principle and in practice in European countries. The distinctive feature of American Co-education is its extension through the secondary school system up to and including the colleges and universities. Co-education in America is mainly to be connected with the spread of the "public high school" system. The rapidity of that movement is strikingly illustrated by the following figures:—In 1850 there were 11 schools of this class. By 1870 the number had increased to 160. The returns for the year ending 30th June 1911 give the number as 10,234, of which 10,172 (over 99 per cent.) were co-educational, containing rather under 400,000 boys and rather over 520,000 girls. Of private schools of the same class there were only 1979; and of these as nearly half as possible (989) were co-educational.

As the Commissioner of Education for 1901 says: "The facts here presented leave no doubt as to the position of our schools with respect to the Co-education of the sexes. It is the policy generally pursued, heartily endorsed by the great majority of supervising officers, and strongly supported by the

[1] "Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1903," p. 1053.

people in all sections of the country." [1] Widespread enthusiasm for education at every stage is perhaps the characteristic of America which foreign observers most frequently note.[2] It may be illustrated by the fact that the proportion of the population in attendance at secondary schools of every kind has risen from 5 per thousand in 1890 to 12 per thousand in 1910. The habit of looking at education from a national standpoint has induced a breadth of view which is not always found in European countries. There is a tendency among European critics to suggest that because economy was a potent factor in introducing Co-education into America, the system must rest mainly on that circumstance for its justification. Nothing could be further from the truth. Both official and other writers in America are fully alive to all the bearings of the question. Thus the Commissioner above quoted goes on to draw attention to " the very great influence of co-education upon the social and business relations of men and women in after years. It explains in great measure the freedom that women enjoy in this country with respect to the pursuit of careers, and especially the large share which they take in the educational work of the country." [3] And we shall see, when we come to examine the alleged reaction against Co-education, that even those who for various reasons desire change are apparently unanimous in their belief in the social

[1] " Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1901," p. 1227.
[2] See " Report of the Mosely Commission, 1903," *passim*.
[3] " Report, 1901," p. 1228.

and moral advantages which are inherent in the system.

We should like here to quote Mr Bryce, whose testimony is the more valuable because, while he speaks from "inside knowledge," his standpoint is yet that of the outside critic. It is commonly objected to Co-education that its claims are too high, since it has not raised moral standards to any exceptional level in America. In view of this criticism it is interesting to find Mr Bryce writing that "the general impression of those who have lived long both in Protestant Europe and in America seems to be that as respects veracity, temperance, the purity of domestic life, tenderness to children and the weak, and general kindliness of behaviour, the native Americans stand rather higher than either the English or the Germans." [1] He also notes—and again touches on a point the critics of Co-education are apt to make much of—"the great frequency of divorce in some states . . . does not appear to betoken immorality, but to be due to the extreme facility with which the law allows one or both of a married pair to indulge their caprice." [2] After describing at length the free-and-easy conditions of intercourse which obtain between young people of either sex, particularly in the West, where Co-education is

[1] "The American Commonwealth," vol. ii., p. 724 (third edition).
[2] *Ibid.* The question of divorce statistics as indications of moral standards is too difficult and complicated to be entered upon here. For the extent to which State interference and regulation may be *the cause* of laxity in sex relationships see H. Ellis, "The Task of Social Hygiene," 61 and 62.

universal, he goes on to say : " There can be no doubt that the pleasure of life is sensibly increased by the greater freedom which transatlantic custom permits ; and, as the Americans insist that no bad results have followed, one notes with regret that freedom declines in the places which deem themselves most civilised. American girls have been, so far as a stranger can ascertain, less disposed to what are called ' fast ways ' than girls of the corresponding classes in England, and exercise in this respect a pretty rigorous censorship over one another. . . . It is all a matter of custom. In the West custom sanctions this easy friendship ; in the Atlantic cities, so soon as people have come to find something exceptional in it, constraint is felt, and a conventional etiquette like that of the Old World begins to replace the innocent simplicity of the older time, the test of whose merit may be gathered from the universal persuasion in America that happy marriages are in the middle and upper ranks more common than in Europe, and this is due to the ampler opportunities which young men and women have of learning one another's characters and habits before becoming betrothed." [1] The high position which women occupy in American civilisation is perhaps America's most valuable contribution to progress. As Mr Bryce again says : " Americans are fond of pointing, and can with perfect justice point to the position their women hold as an evidence of the high level their civilisation has reached." [2] That

[1] " The American Commonwealth," vol. ii., p. 736.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 728.

this position stands in his view in close relation to the prevalent co-educational policy is clear from the above quotations. The Americans themselves take a similar view. The Commissioner of Education for 1903 writes : " Our national impulse in this matter was discerned by De Tocqueville, . . . when as yet our school policies were not well defined. ' The Americans' he says, ' have done all they could to raise woman morally and intellectually to the level of man, and in this respect they appear to me to have excellently understood the true principle of democratic improvement.' His acute mind penetrated thus to the underlying motive of the whole vast work of public education in this country." [1]

The American Government has helped to keep the question alive and open to criticism by itself instituting at intervals comprehensive inquiries into the working of the system and the opinion of the people about it. Investigations of this kind were undertaken in 1891 and 1901, and the results of the latter investigation were incorporated very fully in the Report for the Bureau of Education for the year. On both occasions it was reported that the question evoked little discussion. The system was accepted as perfectly natural and there was not much fault-finding. The report for 1901 reviews the historical side of the question and shows by means of copious extracts from the accumulated literature that many aspects, which some people imagine to be recent

[1] " Report for 1903," p. 1048. We should no doubt express this differently in these days.

discoveries, were familiar to the teachers and educational theorists of previous generations. For example Dr W. T. Harris in his Report of the Public Schools, St Louis, Mo. (1872-1873), deals with the medical and sociological as well as the educational bearings of the subject. On one vital point his evidence is emphatic and has often since been corroborated. " I had noticed," he says, " that the atmosphere of ' mixed ' schools was desexualised, where that of separate schools seemed to have a tendency to develop sexual tension." [1] Dr E. E. White, in " The National Teacher," 1872, foreshadows the character of the present-day movement towards " limited " segregation which is so often exaggerated by critics of Co-education. He writes: " While we would give a daughter an education every whit as thorough and complete as a son, we are not sure that we would have this education in every respect precisely the same. The diversity would not, however, be sufficiently great to necessitate their attending separate schools." [2]

Perhaps the greatest ferment in the question arose in connection with the educational policy of Boston. As one of the Eastern towns Boston adhered to old traditions and maintained a "separate" system of education. In 1873 there appeared a book by a Boston doctor which, as Professor Stanley Hall says, "marked an epoch" in the discussion of Co-education.[3] The main contention of this book (which reached a

[1] " Report for 1901," p. 1241.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 1248.
[3] " Sex in Education," see " Adolescence," vol. ii., p. 569.

seventeenth edition in a few years) was that Co-education is injurious to the proper physical development of girls. The comment of the Report on this book is that "Mr Thomas Wentworth Higginson, however, considerably lessened the effect of Dr Clarke's argument by exposing the small basis of fact, upon which it rested, and pointing out categorically the classes of facts which were required in the premises and which in his opinion were already attainable" [1] It is not always easy to distinguish the school and college aspects of this discussion. Dr Clarke's book "appeared at the height of the movement to secure collegiate opportunities for girls, and was suspected of being unofficially inspired by the unwillingness of Harvard College to admit them." [2] It would appear, indeed—and the point is an important one—that much of the criticism of Co-education is in reality directed against the higher education in general of the female sex. And it is obvious that many of the quite well-founded objections, which were advanced about the period under discussion, were directed against the widespread failure to consider and ensure the health of pupils which prevailed at the time—

[1] *Cf.* also "Report for 1903," p. 1060: "The physiological argument against Co-education and in general against higher disciplinary education for women has shifted its basis slightly in consequence of the tendency to interpret all social phenomena in biological terms, but it reduces practically to that of Dr Clarke. Meanwhile the accumulated experience of thirty years has merely added weight to that which showed the exaggerated inferences from this argument, when it was first advanced."

[2] "Adolescence," *loc. cit.*

and more especially in the case of girls. Thus Dr Beard writes in 1881 : " Everything pushed in an unscientific and distressing manner, nature violated at every step, endless reciting and lecturing and striving to be first—such are the female schools of America at this hour." [1] One result of the discussion provoked by Dr Clarke was the collection of statistics relative to the health of college women in America and in England, which exploded satisfactorily the alarm which had been raised about the danger to women of higher education in general. In 1885 Dr Philbrick of Boston in a circular of information, issued from his office, advocated strenuously the " separate " system. He maintained that the greatest evil in the high school was the risk of injury to the health of girls. He went on to say that in both separate and mixed schools the arrangements from the point of view of health were extremely bad and expressed the opinion that to remedy them effectively for girls in mixed schools was impossible without at the same time endangering the hardihood of boys. In 1890 the Boston school committee conducted a special and extensive inquiry into the whole question.[2] With the exception of one member the committee came unanimously to the conclusion that the prevalence of the separate system in Boston was " an error which may take years to fully eradicate." They deplored that Boston (which we all know to be the intellectual hub of the universe) should " hamper more than any

[1] " Adolescence," vol. ii., p. 570.
[2] " Report for 1901."

other city the rightful advance of girls, and lessen the refining influences in boys, by the separation of the sexes in our schools. . . . It involves the question of the development of the maximum ability of the scholars in moral, intellectual and physical training." Of the 856 opinions (mostly those of teachers, but including also those of physicians, clergymen, etc.), which they collected, 565 were favourable to Co-education. Of the 254 teachers who made the bulk of the opposition, 122 had had experience of girls' schools alone, 109 of boys' schools alone. It is interesting to notice the grounds of opposition. The solitary gentleman who signed the Minority Report referred to "his belief that schools are places in which to educate the young, that all possibility of harm should be kept out of them, and that there should be in them no sexual distractions." He also held that the home and not the school is the proper place for inculcating good social relations between boys and girls. His first objection is founded on suppositions which American experience is practically unanimous in contradicting. His second is invalid unless he should prove that the school contradicted the teaching of the home. And that he does not do. A common objection in the adverse opinions, which are quoted, is the impracticability of the system under the conditions of city life, where the families are not known to each other, etc. Obviously that is a point for consideration, but it is not an objection against the principle. In regard to the views of Dr Philbrick, who seems to have set the ball rolling, the Government Report observes, "He

stood almost alone among our ablest writers on education in his opinion."

But we do not wish to suggest that there is no ground at all for the occasional symptoms of adverse opinion. The commonest charge, which in more modern times at least is brought against American education, is one of "feminisation." Practically all the members of the Mosely Commission, for example, who deal with the question at all, draw attention to the large preponderance of women teachers. Professor Rhys remarks "the wisdom of having (older boys) entirely educated by women is beginning to be questioned in America. . . . At present it is tolerated." [1] Professor Stanley Hall writes, "In most public high schools girls preponderate, especially in the upper classes, and in many of them the boys that remain are practically in a girls' school, sometimes taught chiefly, if not solely, by women teachers at an age when strong men should be in control more than at any other period of life. Boys need a different discipline and moral regimen and atmosphere." [2] The reasons for the preponderance of women on the staff and girls among the pupils are interesting and merit investigation. The peculiar conditions of the economic growth of the United States—the rapid development of vast natural resources and the concentration of an originally small but ever-growing population on a task, which for generations swallowed all the supplies of labour which were brought to it,

[1] "Mosely Commission Report," p. 320.
[2] *Op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 619.

and yet asked for more—these things have led to an absorption of the masculine energies of the nation in the production and distribution of wealth. The seeds of culture brought by early settlers from overseas might have perished untended, had it not been for the fostering care of women. To some extent American women have played the part which was that of women in the days of chivalry, when men were too absorbed in warlike pursuits to read books, as now in America they are given over to the canning of beef. Again, the higher education of women has fitted them for the posts of instruction, and they have thus occupied the chairs left vacant by men. The hand that rocks the cradles does not indeed by any means rule the whole of the modern educational world in America, as we shall see, but there is a distinct tendency in that direction. Similar reasons help to account for the preponderance of girls over boys " in the upper classes." As Mr Barclay points out in the "Mosely Commission Report," the question with a boy in America is not so much whether he shall go into business or not, as whether to continue his education beyond a certain stage will fit him, or the reverse, for the task of dollar-making. And on the whole he tends to leave early and to set to work on the dollars as soon as possible. He proceeds to fill his pockets while his sister is still filling her mind.

But before we go further with this question of " feminisation " it would be as well to look at the figures. It is evident that while there is some basis for the charge, there is also some exaggeration. In

1911 there were in attendance at the high schools, public and private combined, over 494,000 boys and nearly 621,000 girls. On the staffs of these schools there were 25,138 men and 32,102 women. The preponderance is evident, but we hardly think that the figures in reference to teachers justify the sweeping statement of Professor Rhys, as quoted above! In elementary schools indeed the preponderance is much greater, but we are not concerned with that, and it is not apparently regarded with disfavour. Even in regard to the secondary schools there is a qualification to be made which detracts still further from the validity of sweeping statements about feminisation. We have often seen references to the vicious custom of having headmistresses to schools, where there are boys approaching manhood in years. But Miss Burstall, who published her impressions of a visit to America a few years ago, and naturally paid especial attention to the woman's side of the education question, gives a very different account. It is well known that educational headships in the United States are to a greater extent than with us posts of administration. In her account of the position of women Miss Burstall points out that they are conspicuously lacking in the sphere of administration. In regard to educational administration she says their position is "conspicuously inferior" to that of their fellows in England. "The headship, according to American opinion, must, if the school be large and important, be held by a man, even when the schools, like some of those in Boston and New

York, are for girls only." She makes the surprising statement that "there are not 250 headmistresses of public secondary schools in America, as there are in England." [1]

But, when due allowance has been made for exaggeration in regard to the facts of the case, it may still remain true that the preponderance of femininity under the peculiar conditions of American life has harmful effects on the education of boys. Stanley Hall is emphatic on this point; after describing mental differences of sex, with which we shall deal later, he goes on to say, "The boy sooner grows restless in a curriculum where form takes precedence over content. He revolts at much method with meagre matter. He craves utility, and when all these instincts are denied, without knowing what is the matter, he drops out of school."

The danger of this alleged feminisation in the wider sphere of national life and ideals is well set forth by Professor Münsterberg, who looks upon American education through German spectacles, but with the same inside knowledge as that possessed by Mr Bryce. We quote him at length, as his view of characteristic sex differences is of value in itself. "The immediate outcome of that feminine type is woman's tact and æsthetic feeling, her instinctive insight, her enthusiasm, her sympathy, her natural wisdom and morality; but on the other hand also her lack of clearness and logical consistency, her tendency to hasty generalisation, her mixing of principles, her

[1] "Impressions of American Education in 1908."

undervaluation of the abstract and of the absent, her lack of deliberation, her readiness to follow her feelings and emotions. Even these defects can beautify family life, can make our social surroundings attractive, and soften and complete the strenuous, earnest and consistent public activity of the man ; but they do not give the power to meet these public duties without man's harder logic. If the whole national civilisation should receive the feminine stamp, it would become powerless and without decisive influence on the world's progress." [1] There is indeed much virtue in an " if." The official reply of the United States to this warning, theoretically at least, knocks the bottom out of it by suggesting that the condition is not fulfilled. " In order to emphasise his view, the general importance of which is hardly a matter of question, Professor Münsterberg has purposely, it seems, exaggerated the tendencies which, in his judgment, are discoverable in our system, and has forecast possible evil results, should it ever be carried to the extreme imagined. Fortunately, as the author also foresees, no such extreme condition is to be anticipated." [2] But additional reasons for supposing that the dangers are chimerical are provided by the Professor himself, and his reasoning here is especially valuable, as being that of a psychologist of repute, and as telling against criticism, which may be and is brought against any and every system of Co-education. " The social psychologist," he writes, " can

[1] " American Traits." Chapter on American Women.
[2] " Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1901," p. 1298.

feel no shadow of doubt that neither Co-education nor equality of opportunities has done anything to eliminate those characteristic features of the female mind, which are well known the world over and which it is our blessing not to have lost. The laws of nature are stronger than the theories of men." [1] It is true that he is talking here of the effect on the feminine mind ; but we shall hardly exceed the limits of his theory in supposing that the " laws of nature " apply with equal force in the case of the masculine. The point is worth pressing home, as one is so often confronted with psychological bogies in this matter. Still more striking is the assertion of M. Compayré, the French psychologist, from whose book we have already quoted, who winds up that work (in which he expresses himself in a sense decidedly unfavourable to Co-education) with this peroration : " Quelque effort que fasse le féminisme pour effacer la distinction des sexes, pour les assimiler l'un à l'autre, en les confondant dans les mêmes études, dans les mêmes sports, en les conviant aux mêmes professions, ou leur rapprochant leurs costumes ; la nature plus forte maintiendra toujours la différence dans les modalités de leur sensibilité et de leur intelligence ; et la psychologie du jeune homme, la psychologie de la jeune fille seront toujours des études distinctes." [2] He thus affirms the impotence of a more exaggerated form of Co-education than has entered into our wildest dreams to effect the evil result which he and others seem to anticipate

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 194-195.

from a much milder brew. A more charming example of a man digging a hole beneath his own feet we do not remember to have encountered. Mr Bryce agrees with the psychologists: "Nature is quite strong enough to make the differences of temperament she creates persistent even under influences which might seem likely to diminish them." [1]

Such authoritative assurances ought to convince us that although "the manners of a particular age and the customs of a particular nation" may prevent the very best from being got out of a co-educational system, at least there is no danger that the "true and unchangeable character" of adolescence in either sex will suffer in the core of its being from contact with the other sex. People of ordinary common-sense were well aware of this all along; but psychologists have a habit of getting their necks entangled in the intricacies of their own arguments. We could wish that Professor Stanley Hall had given a more definite account of his ideal education for boys. Since the claims of Co-education in their case rest particularly upon the social and moral influences involved, it is unfortunate that Professor Stanley Hall, as M. Compayré complains, neglects somewhat conspicuously just that aspect of masculine education. "Sur l'éducation de la volonté, sur la formation des sentiments moraux et sociaux, le livre de l'*Adolescence* ne nous offre guère que des vues éparses; l'auteur n'a pas pris la peine de les condenser et de les coordonner." [2]

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 734.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 167.

Professor Stanley Hall is well known in English educational circles as a protagonist of the "reaction against Co-education," which we are assured is daily gathering momentum in the States. It will be well before proceeding to discuss his opinions at greater length to examine the facts about this reaction, so far as one may from an outside point of view. So long ago as 1901 the Commissioner of Education wrote: "It should be observed with respect to Co-education in the higher institutions that rumours of a reaction in sentiment, which from time to time arise, have always proved upon investigation to be grossly exaggerated or absolutely groundless." [1] Nine years later it is reported: "As regards the Co-education of the sexes in the public schools of the United States, the situation remains practically unchanged from year to year, although occasional experiments at what is technically termed segregation serve to keep the subject before public attention." [2] The point of view which this movement generally assumes is succinctly put by Edward Howard Griggs in his "Moral Education": "Any separation from the whole of society is to be admitted only for a specific gain greater than the loss. . . . Always there is a loss of a powerful lever for good conduct and a force in moulding sound ideals, where the sexes are separated in the larger areas of their activity. Thus Co-education should be the rule, and the separation of the sexes the exception, admitted only where we believe the specific gain more

[1] "Education Report, 1901," p. 1233.
[2] "Report, 1910," p. 126.

than compensates for the moral loss." [1] The most important of these " occasional experiments " is that carried out at the Englewood High School, Chicago. Discussing this experiment, the Principal writes: " I would not have them (boys and girls) attend separate schools, because of the loss of social influence upon each other." [2] Again he says elsewhere, " My conviction is that we should keep the boy and the girl in the same high school so as to preserve the same social environment, but teach them in different classes so as to adapt the work to the highest needs of each." [3] Apart from experiments, separate schools are, as we have seen, to some extent part of the established policy in certain Eastern towns. But " it is important to remember how far local conditions explain these initial distinctions. . . . That there was a lingering spirit of patrician exclusiveness in the Eastern preferences for separate high schools is indicated by the contrary attitude in respect to normal schools." [4] In many cases the existence of separate schools is explained by the fact that the agitation for higher education for girls only arose after the establishment of separate boys' schools and it was found more convenient to build separate girls' schools than to adopt Co-education.

As we saw above, separate education is more common relatively in private than in public high

[1] " Moral Education," p. 124.
[2] *School Review*, December 1906.
[3] " Report, 1909," p. 178.
[4] " Report, 1903," p. 1054.

schools. On this point Miss Burstall says: "Parents who send their children to the private school are not influenced by theoretical objections to Co-education." And in regard to the apparent growth of the "separate" principle in these schools we are told: "In private institutions the percentage of students in non-co-educational schools is increasing in comparison with the percentage in the co-educational; but the gross number in both types of private schools is falling off. In other words, the co-educational private school is yielding more rapidly than the other kind to the inroads of publicly supported secondary education." [1]

To return to the Englewood experiment, it is from an English point of view very curious to learn what was the chief motive and aim of the limited segregation there adopted. With us not only in the co-educational controversy, but in all questions relating to the higher education of girls, alarm is frequently expressed lest competition with the masculine sex should strain or break the weaker vessel. In regard to Englewood we hear that "for many years school officials have noted a characteristic difference between the attitudes of boys and girls towards school work, and that *a large portion of the boys fail to attain the same degree of scholarship that a majority of the girls reach.*" [2] We are assured that girls on entering the

[1] Dutton and Snedden, "Educational Administration in the United States," p. 369.

[2] *School Review*, May 1910, "Advantages of Limited Sex Segregation in the High School."

high school are " more mature, more honest in work, with greater power of concentration, and are more apt in acquiring information. This lasts for a year or two ; then the boys develop." [1] Mr Armstrong tried segregation during the early teens in order that the boys might be able to work with the girls again " in the middle of the high school course." He found that girls were better than boys at acquiring a new language. It was convenient to teach the boy apart in order to provide " devices for his memory." In science the girls needed more preliminary training, being, it seems, more deficient in power of observation and classification. Mr Armstrong reports that " the segregation of the sexes during the first and second years of high school holds more boys in school, greatly improves their scholarship, and removes from them that feeling of unfair comparisons due to differences in degree of maturity of children of the same age but opposite sex." [2] A scheme designed to check the early leaving of boys may prove ultimately of value to Co-education, in America, by restoring the balance of the sexes. It is explained that under this " limited segregation " plan " the sexes are separated only during recitations, and during only the first part of adolescence," so that the social relations of boys and girls, though less than before, are " still sufficient to preserve the advantages recognised in co-educational schools." [3]

[1] " Education of Girls in U.S.A.," p. 164.
[2] *School Review*, May 1910.
[3] *Ibid.*, December 1906, " Limited Segregation."

Another experiment of this kind is being carried out at the Cleveland Central High School. It is closely associated with the "widespread movement for vocational training." Principal Harris of that school recognises that vocational training is important for girls as well as for boys; he points out that most girls in the United States require training both for professional and for home life, as a short spell of the former practically always precedes their marriage. He suggests accordingly specialisation from fourteen to sixteen. With the special needs of America in this respect we are not concerned; but we note as important for our argument that Principal Harris "expresses the opinion, however, that they (these problems) can all be met by adjustments that are possible under the co-education plan, a conclusion which seems to him borne out by the record of his own school." [1]

While it seems likely that the spread of vocational training will tend to differentiation in the *curricula* of the sexes, the opinion is general that this is quite compatible with co-educational establishments. There are references to the growing flexibility of the high school *curricula* [2] which make it possible for girls to differ from boys in the aggregate as boys from each other. It must be remembered that competition and examination strain have been to a great extent eliminated in American schools. While it is admitted that many girls are still over-stimulated, we are

[1] "Report, 1910," p. 129.

[2] Dutton and Snedden, "Educational Administration," p. 369.

assured that "there is little evidence that this has any persistent connection with Co-education"[1]; it is attributed to that general lack of oversight of which American writers were complaining a generation ago. Mr W. C. Fletcher, however, while he is not altogether favourable to Co-education, gives it as his impression that girls in American schools are less hard worked than they are commonly alleged to be in English schools. He thinks that the "elective" system (mentioned above) avoids many difficulties.[2] About this system we are informed that "the course of study in the secondary schools is identical for the sexes, but latitude is given in the election of studies. Equivalents are substituted and accepted, so that at the end of the four years, when the young person has completed the prescribed course of study, it does not follow that each has pursued the same line of training"[3]

It is not necessary to go into the question of Co-education in colleges and universities. But we may note that there are similar movements and experiments in that sphere, and that they no more than the others invalidate the claims of Co-education.[4] The Report for 1910 sums up the general bearing of the whole question thus: "On the whole the question of Co-education appears more and more as one of

[1] Dutton and Snedden, "Educational Administration."
[2] "Mosely Commission Report," p. 143.
[3] "Report, 1903," p. 353. Miss A. Zimmern ("Methods of Education in America," p. 13) speaks approvingly of this "system of carefully chosen electives."
[4] See, *e.g.*, "Report for 1901," p. 1232 *et seq.*; 1909, p. 181 *et seq.*; 1910, p. 131 *et seq.*

adjustment to prevailing conditions; hence experiments at temporary segregation, or complete separation of students on the basis of sex are not likely to effect any radical change in the prevailing policy of the different sections of the country in this respect."

In the next chapter we shall proceed to consider in greater detail the position of Professor Stanley Hall, who, as the *Hibbert Journal* tells us, is "the illustrious author of 'Adolescence' . . . the creator (more than anyone else) of the genetic philosophy of education, and the greatest figure in the educational world to-day." [1]

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, October 1913. Article "Public Schools and the Empire," Cecil Reddie. To the same article we are indebted for the following valuable information: "As for Co-education, in America, where the experience of it is longer and wider than in all the rest of the world taken together, *there is a strong and steady movement against it.* . . ."

CHAPTER VII

THE EXPERIENCE OF AMERICA (*continued*)

PROFESSOR STANLEY HALL lets loose upon the case for Co-education all the thunder of the Ologies. Biology warns us, through him, that men are ever katabolic, women anabolic. These latter are nearer to Nature, the mother of all; their grasp is upon the past and the future, while we, who are mere men, cling to the drifting straws of the present. The professor opens to our view a new philosophy of sex, wherein the "blind worship of mere mental illumination" gives place to an apotheosis of wifehood and motherhood. Only along the path of increasing differentiation does evolution, starting, it may be, from some remote bi-sexual state, proceed onward to the ideal. It is not for us to tamper with Nature (albeit, as we have seen, she is not to be tampered with) but to follow her lead and in education, as in life generally, to distinguish and develop to the uttermost the subtle differences of sex. Yet we find it a little difficult to disentangle Professor Hall's real views on the woman question from the mixture of rhapsody and science through the medium of which he presents them. He is not averse to the higher education of women; yet he seems to prefer the unlettered heroines

of Shakespeare; and in a passage of fine feeling, which is perhaps more marked by reverence than relevance, he inquires: "Who ever asked if the holy mother, whom the wise men adored, knew the astronomy of the Chaldees, or had studied Egyptian or Babylonian, or even whether she knew how to read or write her own tongue, and who has ever thought of caring?" [1] And in regard to masculine destinies his eloquence on the subject of Jill makes him, as we noted above, a trifle sketchy about Jack.

But if he is elusive as a rhapsodical scientist he comes nearer to our comprehension when he materialises as an alarmist physician. He has pages of statistics designed to show that the higher education of women, as at present carried on, is endangering the vitality and persistence of the American race by its effect directly on fecundity and indirectly on the average age of marriage and number of marriages. We are not concerned to defend the higher education of women in general, which may safely be left to look after itself, but quote three paragraphs which have a direct and, as it seems to us (though we are well aware of the fallibility of figures), significant bearing upon the question of Co-education. Summing up some

[1] M. Compayré (*op. cit.*, p. 131) is apposite here: "Mais il est clair que M. Stanley Hall, qui n'est nullement un esprit rétrograde, imbu de préjugés vieilles, et qui ne renonce nullement à 'pédagogiser' pour le sexe féminin, cède simplement à un mouvement d'impatience et de mauvaise humeur contre les excès d'une instruction à outrance, qui risquerait d'altérer la nature, le vrai caractère des femmes." The last clause is curious when read in connection with M. Compayré's peroration (see p. 175).

investigations of Professor Dewey, the author writes : " On the whole, Dewey concluded that one-third more break down from emotional strain in female colleges than in co-educational institutions." Again : " Mrs Sidgwick in England and Miss Hayes in this country asked 32 and 42 questions respectively, the former addressed to 4 English, and the latter to 12 American co-educational institutions. The results show that the Americans are better throughout, although it is possible that the 15 per cent. of the English students and the 45 per cent. of the American students, who did not answer the questionnaire, may have contained a large proportion of those who were ill." As regards marriage, " the editor of *The Overland Monthly* found from the register of the year 1890, including 1078 names of the New England co-educational colleges, that 24·7 were married as against 14·8 of the graduates of the women's colleges. In New York, of the graduates of the preceding twelve years, these percentages were 25·7 and 20·6 respectively, and of all co-educational colleges 34·8 were married as against 22·9 of the women's colleges." [1] In face of these figures which he himself quotes, it is quite amazing to find Professor Hall writing later (p. 621) : " Thus, I believe, although of course it is impossible to prove, that this (*i.e.* dis-

[1] That marriage rates and birth rates are infallible indications of progress or the reverse is somewhat generally assumed. The question is one for experts ; that the truth is by no means all on one side may be seen from H. Ellis, " The Task of Social Hygiene," Chapter V.

illusioning due to Co-education) is one of the factors of a decreasing percentage of marriage among educated young men and women." But it is only fair to say that Professor Hall himself is not so opposed to Co-education in colleges as in schools. "In an ideal society," he says, "with ideal men in it, women's education should focus on motherhood and wifehood"; and he thinks that in the co-educational school the girl's outlook on life receives an altogether wrong orientation. We have no wish to obscure issues by raising debating society points, but it really is difficult to catch his exact meaning at times. He writes, as others do, of the "progressive feminisation of secondary education" and the "feminisation of the school spirit, discipline and personnel." Yet he also writes curiously: "In the progressive numerical feminisation of our schools *most teachers, perhaps naturally and necessarily, have more or less masculine ideals*, and this does not encourage the development of those that constitute the glory of womanhood." And in an earlier chapter, when dealing with statistics relating to teachers' influence, he writes: "Four-fifths of the men, and nearly one half of the women, however, got most help from men (*i.e.* in their schooldays). *Male teachers, especially near adolescence, seem most helpful for both sexes.*" [1] Further, in the ideal girls' school, which he constructs with fine imagination and

[1] "Adolescence," vol. ii., p. 386, *cf.* Miss Isabel Rhys' "Education of Girls in Switzerland," p. 2; "On the whole, the men teachers have the most beneficial effect on the girls, especially as concerns their powers of expression."

splendid disregard for practicability,[1] he opines "there should be at least one healthful, wise, large-souled, honourable, married and attractive man, and if possible, several of them." He should, it seems, have many other virtues—"But, even if he lack all these latter qualities, though he be so poised that impulsive girls can turn their hearts inside out in his presence, and *perhaps even weep on his shoulder*, the presence of such a being . . . would be the centre of an atmosphere most wholesomely tonic." Well, really, you know——. Again, he complains [2] of the tendency of American girls to choose masculine rather than feminine ideal characters. But elsewhere he quotes statistics which suggest that "The girl likes biography, but in the high school, true to her sex, she prefers stories of great women rather than great men, *but, because she cannot get them, reads those of men.*" [3] It is interesting in face of these curious inconsistencies to refer to the definite opinion of an outside observer. Miss Alice Woods thinks that "in some ways . . . American women are more feminine than the modern type of English women." She mentions their care for dress, their disinclination on the whole for games, politics, and administration, and *attributes this femininity to Co-education.*[4]

On the question of Co-education in itself Professor Hall writes: "Boys need a different discipline and

[1] *E.g.*, Each girl is to have three rooms to herself.
[2] *E.g.*, pp. 387, 619.
[3] p. 475.
[4] Quoted in Miss Burstall's "Impressions, etc.," p. 281, note.

moral regimen and atmosphere. They also need a different method of work. Girls excel them in learning and memorisation, accepting studies upon suggestion or authority, but are quite at sea when set to make tests and experiments that give individuality a chance for self-expression, which is one of the best things in boyhood." He writes also : " Girls and boys are often interested in different aspects of the same topic and this may have a tendency to broaden the viewpoint of both and bring it into sympathy with that of the other, but the question still remains whether one be not too much attracted to the sphere of the other, especially girls to that of boys. No doubt some girls become a little less gushy, their conduct more thoughtful, and their sense of responsibility greater." Again : " It is utterly impossible without injury to hold girls to the same standards of conduct, regularity, severe moral accountability, and strenuous mental work, that boys need." As Professor Hall himself sees, there are intellectual advantages in the teaching of the sexes together. As regards the disadvantages (if any) we have seen that American opinion when it admits them (and that of foreign observers) considers them obviated by the system of electives, while those who have carried the differentiation to the point of segregation are emphatic on the possibility and the importance of still combining this with an effective measure of Co-education. Co-education need not of course involve identical treatment. Are girls to lose the advantage (admitted by Professor Hall) of learning " greater responsibility " because they cannot—

so it seems—reach without injury such a standard as that " exacted from boys " ? And when we see that one of the motives for the " reaction " against Co-education is the unfairness to the boy of competition with mature girls, need we pay much attention to the alleged " utter impossibility " of such " strenuous mental work " for girls as is needed for boys ?

Turning to the case of boys under Co-education, while we are willing to recognise the possibility of some injury to them under the present conditions of American education, with its general lack of discipline—in some degree no doubt due to the *preponderance* [1] (exaggerated though this commonly is), but not the *presence* of women in the high schools,—and its absence of stimulus,[2] there are certain obvious inadequacies in this part of the anti-co-educational philosophy which astonish us. In accordance with his biological principle, that sex differences are to be developed to the extreme, Professor Hall inquires " whether boys, in order to be well virified later, ought not to be so boisterous and rough as to be, at times, unfit companions for girls. . . ." We should most of us answer in the affirmative, accepting especially the qualification " at times." But that is not incompatible with Co-education. We should quite agree too that boys need men as well as women in

[1] The distinction is Dr Gray's (" Mosely Commission Report ").
[2] (The American system) " has managed so to repress intellectual competition that it has diverted emulation and ambition to non-intellectual interests."—F. C. S. Schiller in *Fortnightly Review*, April 1913.

charge of them ; and that where this does not happen boys are neglected and injured. But we think Professor Hall goes too far towards the other extreme in seeking a remedy. He admits that under Co-education "there is much evidence that certain boys' vices are mitigated." In the opinions of English headmasters and Public School men, which we reviewed in a previous chapter, there was little emphasis on such "mitigation" in English Public School life: in fact there was "much evidence" of a quite contrary tendency attributed directly to "the separation of the sexes." But the American writer thinks that the American schoolboy "with a robust tone and with a truly boy life, such as prevails at Harrow, Eton and Rugby, would have fought it through and have done well. . . . Of course on the whole, perhaps, they are made more gentlemanly . . . *but something is the matter with the boy in early teens who can be truly called 'a perfect gentleman.'* That should come later, when the brute and animal element have had opportunity to work themselves off in a healthful, normal way. They still have football, etc. . . . but there is danger of a settled eviration." It is a matter of opinion, but we should have thought that the preservation of true "gentlemanliness" during the "brute and animal" period a thing not indeed to be avoided, but rather to be sought after. The biologist's reverence for the animal seems to lead him to curious passes at times. In an earlier part of the book he gives an account of his ideal of student life for youths. Anent the indispensability of "freedom" he suggests that the youth should

" go to extremes at the age when excesses teach wisdom with amazing rapidity, if he is to become a true knight of the spirit and his own master. *Ziegler frankly told German students that about one-tenth of them would be morally lost in this process, but insisted that on the whole more good was done than by restraint.*"[1] Our only comment on this doctrine of freedom shall be a quotation from (strangely enough !) the very next page : " *that class of woman, which, Ziegler states, brought twenty-five per cent. of the students of the University of Berlin in a single year to physicians.*"

Let us summarise briefly a few more of the alleged dangers of Co-education. When boys find themselves unable to compete in school with girls " who naturally excel them " (yet, as was also said, are below them in capacity for " strenuous mental work ") it seems they fall back upon their superiority *quâ* masculine beings—thereby exhibiting an unsuitable precocity ! Also they learn to despise the humanistic culture, in the pursuit of which they are outstripped, and betake themselves too early to professional and vocational studies. Moreover they are impaled by the Professor on the horns of a most pitiable dilemma. Either they suffer grievously from " half-conscious cerebrations about wedlock inevitably more insistent with constant girl companionship " ; or else use breeds immunity and they become " bachelors before their time." We suppose the former alternative provides the Professor with the statistics about co-educational marriages, while the latter is the basis of his argument that

[1] *Op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 400.

marriages are hindered by Co-education. Anyhow, we think the ratiocination too fragile to bear the weight of a conclusion such as this following :—" Better some risk of gross thoughts and even acts, to which phylogeny and recapitulation so strongly incline him, than this subtle eviration." We cannot bow the knee even before Phylogeny and Recapitulation.

If things are really so bad as they are here painted it is surely strange that the prophet (though we remember the adage) finds apparently so little support in his own country. Writing in *The Spectator*, 23rd May 1908, Miss Alice Woods says, " Never once in my five months' tour did I come across any American teacher who warmly supported Mr Stanley Hall's views." And this testimony is borne out by the Annual Education Reports, which are clearly written from an impartial standpoint and seldom make statements unsupported by documentary evidence. The " reaction " against Co-education therein and elsewhere recorded is seen to be very strictly limited, and the promoters of it still insist on the value of Co-education in just that sphere in which Professor Stanley Hall seems most to deplore it. The evidence of America is overwhelmingly on the side of Co-education ; and most of all in regard to the moral and social advantages which are claimed for it. The charge, that Co-education leads to " disillusionment," destroys romance and lessens the probability of marriage, is a charge frequently brought, and as frequently denied by those who have had experience of the system. It is refuted also not only by the figures which Stanley

Hall himself quotes, but also by that principle which he in common with other scientific objectors to Co-education accepts—that fundamental instincts implanted by Nature, while they may be trained and guided, are not likely to be uprooted by the devices of men. What Professor Hall says of the psychology of sex relationships in a co-educational school seems to us to be flatly contradicted by the testimony both of the rest of America and of our own experience. We in England, when we talk of sex tension or strain, associate it with separate schools and regard it as an evil ; and those who visit America after experience of English Public Schools are wont to be impressed by the absence of that evil there. Thus Dr Gray, with a clearly implied comparison, writes that Co-education " is largely corrective of (certainly in no way increases) the tinge of effeminacy which the preponderance of the woman teacher alluded to above is unhappily producing. There is an absolute *absence* (I might well add *disappearance*) of sexual strain." This is confirmed by our English experience of Co-education. For it is a feature noted not merely by those who work in co-educational schools, but particularly by visitors and observers from outside, that Co-education brings about a natural and healthy relationship between boys and girls and creates an atmosphere of free and easy intercourse, which is an ideal environment for adolescent life. But Professor Hall seems to think that whatever value there is in Co-education depends upon the maintenance of an acute sex consciousness on both sides. He associates

the remission of sex tension with a weakening of ideals, leading to disillusionment and disinclination to marriage. " The impulse to be at one's best in the presence of the other sex grows lax and sex tension remits . . . so that there is less motive to indulge in the ideal conduct which such motives inspire, because the call for it is incessant." Granted for the sake of argument that the romantic or chivalric ideal of sex relationship (which we are generally led to suppose has been replaced in modern ideals by something better, because more complete) loses something of its glamour in the co-educational school—we should still feel moved to ask whether " the ideal conduct which such motives inspire " is likely to be the more easily found when the occasion for such motives is absent altogether.

Let us recall in conclusion the ominous remarks of M. Compayré, which we put at the head of this chapter, and consider how far the experience of America in this matter is of value for us in England. We are warned by the practical men that education must adapt itself to circumstances and especially to the social institutions of the country. In America, we are told, women are treated with phenomenal respect, as being a little lower than the angels. How far this makes possible or is made possible by Co-education is a nice question not to be determined by interminable hair-splitting. But he who supposes that the current of influence sets one way only must be as blind as the proverbial bat. As we have seen, there is

in America a close and conscious connection between Co-education and the position of women. We do not say that because Co-education will improve the position of women, therefore it is to be introduced without consideration or discrimination into this country. In America the spirit of democracy at an early date placed women theoretically on a high level, and then proceeded to realise the theory by means of practical measures—notably by Co-education. In England we cannot so easily start *a priori*: our slate is not clean. The distinction does make a difference: it means that the introduction of Co-education must be carefully carried out, with due attention to local conditions, to social standards, and perhaps also to class distinctions; it probably means a task which Government, whether central or local, is of itself peculiarly unfitted to perform; it means, that is to say, much more scope for private initiative and experiment and a much more liberal and less bureaucratic theory as to the conditions which justify Government aid.

But there are other features of the exuberant democracy in America, the absence of which in England tells more in our favour. We call to mind Plato's vision of that extremely democratic state where the very animals exhibited their independence by hustling you off the pavement. The modern counterpart of that seems to be a state where even the children are averse to discipline.[1] That there is a

[1] "For, while the American family life has a pervasive quality of tender devotion and considerate courtesy unexcelled in any land,

value in the self-reliance of the American child we should be the last to deny. But that self-reliance cannot be achieved without the sacrifice of discipline we must regard as a grave fallacy. We should surmise —and the evidence seems to support us—that it is boys rather than girls who suffer from the extreme laxity of discipline which appears to pervade American education. And this brings us to a crucial point. In a nation, whose general standard of discipline is low, it is not likely to be raised by a preponderance, however small, of women in the schools. We freely recognise the argument that boys need strong masculine control at certain stages of their growth, and under the peculiar conditions of America it seems to us very likely—and here we agree with the critics of *American* Co-education—that they do not always get it. But it is clearly uncritical to attribute this misfortune simply to the presence or even to the preponderance of women in the schools. The democratic spirit of indiscipline which characterises so much of American life finds its way the more easily into the schools because of that close connection between scholastic and public life which in itself is so excellent a thing. The fact that nearly all the schools of America are day schools makes the difficulty greater still. The maintenance of discipline is much

and the moral standards retain much of the potency of their puritanic origin, the puritanic severity has entirely disappeared from the family discipline, and in nearly every home in which I have been, whether of the rich or the poor, the children were the masters of the house."—Alexander Francis, "Americans: An Impression," p. 130.

easier in the boarding school—a point which is very relevant to the present discussion, since we in England are much more concerned with the boarding school. As an example of the lower standard of discipline in America, one may take the question of corporal punishment for boys. The strong objection which is taken to this form of punishment in America is the outcome, not of feminine influence, but of a theory of the rights of the individual—more particularly of the citizen—which has no counterpart in English traditions. As we are strong believers in the value of corporal punishment for boys, we are inclined to think that the American attitude on this point alone goes far to explain the indiscipline of the American boy.

It is sometimes urged that the average standard of intellectual attainment in American schools is much lower than in English schools. If this be true, it is true only with reservations. Certainly the members of an English Upper VI. reach a far higher standard in their special subject, be it classics or mathematics. And probably the average English boy would pass a better examination in prepared work. On the other hand, the hopelessly idle and therefore hopelessly ignorant boy is a purely English product. There is in American schools none of that tradition of idleness which seems so ingrained in the English boy—as a result, we are convinced, of the unnatural and artificial character of a monastic education, rather than of any double dose of original sin. So far as Co-education is, as we believe it to be, a remedy for

idleness, the advantage is all on the side of the American boy. That in spite of this advantage he yet fails to reach the standard of the best English boys is due to two causes in chief, which have no necessary connection with Co-education, and in any case are peculiar to America. The general indiscipline to which we have referred shows itself in school work, not in a low standard of industry, but in lack of accuracy and method—points in which English educational traditions are far in advance of American. Secondly, the American boy, as compared with the English, takes up an enormous number of subjects, and so dissipates his energies over a wide field without attaining proficiency in any one department.

But America, as our opponents are fond of reminding us, is not England. We are still in the main a disciplined nation. We are more aware perhaps than our transatlantic cousins of the distinction between liberty and licence (as also of the distinction between size and importance, and between haste and speed). Above all, in our Public Schools the tradition of discipline is strong. We respect corporal punishment. We practise the prefectorial system—an institution altogether alien to American tradition, but a powerful agent of discipline. Nowhere perhaps does the difference manifest itself so clearly as in a comparison between English and American games. The spirit of the latter is eminently individualistic ; of the former, co-operative.

We have, then, both in our social manners and our educational traditions, the one merit whose lack, as it

seems to us, prevents America from getting the best there is to be got out of Co-education. A preponderance of women in American schools may help to dissolve further what is already in a state of solution. We see no reason to expect a preponderance of feminine influence in English co-educational schools. That the presence of women on the staff will tend to loosen the bonds of discipline, and to destroy the manhood of English boys, is a view which is contradicted by all the probabilities of the case, and, what is more important, by the records of our own experience. Experience has proved that it is possible to admit women on the staff and girls among the pupils, while yet preserving for boys the essential spirit of a Public School. How far it is possible or desirable that girls should be imbued with a like spirit, and whether, if differences are to be allowed, they are compatible with the unity of school life and organisation, are questions we shall discuss elsewhere.

As a nation we have a genius for compromise. Here surely is as fair a field for the exercise of that delicate virtue as any we have yet tried. To combine the vigour and manliness of the English Public School with the softer virtues and purer atmosphere which American women and girls bring to the American school; to join virility to gentleness, to strengthen without spoiling the tender graces of womanhood; and to unite freedom with a spirit of discipline—that is the task which should lie before the schools of England, and it is one well worth the achieving.

CHAPTER VIII

THE BOY AND THE GIRL

"A man in his naturall perfection is fiers, hardy, stronge in opinion, couaitous of glorie, desirous of knowledge. . . . The good nature of a woman is to be milde, timerouse, tractable, benigne, of sure remembrance. . . . Let us suppose there to be a concorde of all the saide qualities, being ioyned together, as I have set them in ordre. . . . And in this wise *fiersenesse* ioyned with *mildenesse* maketh *Severitie*; *Audacitie* with timerositie maketh *Magnanimitie*; wilfull opinion and *Tractabilitie* make the *constance* a vertue; *Couaitise of Glorie* adourned with *benignitie* causeth honour; *desire of Knowlege* with *sure remembrance* procureth *Sapience*. . . . These qualities, in this wise beinge knitte together . . . do expresse or sette out the figure of very nobilitie. . . ."—THOMAS ELYOT, Knight, "The Boke named The Governour," 1531.

WE saw in the first chapter to what an extent the case against the monastic system of education for boys may be based upon the evidence of those who are most in a position to appreciate that system. But in the matter of defects there is apt to be a long step with us in England between recognition and remedy. Conservatism, it must be remembered, is of two kinds. There is the deep-rooted instinct to cling to things established on the ground that persistence is of itself as safe a test of value as any other; there is also the *vis inertiae*, which remains even when the need for

change is recognised. It may be confidently asserted that the movement for reform will have to impinge upon this second kind of conservatism from many directions before it creates any distinct impression.

There is one development especially of recent educational theory which seems bound to lead to a review of the policy of sex segregation. We mean the movement for the application of psychology and scientific thought in general to education. In no direction is this movement likely to prove so fruitful of change as in its influence on the treatment of adolescence and therefore of sex. The psychology of adolescence centres inevitably upon the problem of sex, its growth and treatment. It is unfortunate from the English point of view that the most authoritative and comprehensive work on this subject should be written by an American. The "separate" boarding school, so characteristic of England, is practically unknown in America. We cannot therefore expect that the particular problems in adolescent education to which that institution gives rise should receive adequate treatment in Professor Stanley Hall's "Adolescence." And we have seen that they do not. The author praises the vigorous and manly tone which characterises the English Public School system ; but he appears to be quite unconscious that there is another side to the shield. He seizes upon the defects of Co-education as practised under American conditions, but he is—quite naturally—oblivious to the evils which are more pronounced in English than in American schools ; he is therefore hardly in a position

to appreciate to the full the merits of a co-educational system from an English point of view. At the same time English psychologists, who cannot but be aware of the evils which a separate system produces in this country, tend naturally, from their inexperience of Co-education, to accept the conclusions of the American writer without considering how far his arguments are applicable to English conditions, or even how far they represent the considered judgment of America as a whole.

There is, however, one scientific writer who has treated the problems of adolescent education from an English point of view, with particular reference to the Public School system. In his "Introduction to the Study of Adolescence," a work which shows intimate acquaintance with the conditions both of Preparatory and of Public Schools, Mr Cyril Bruyn Andrewes condemns the separate system root and branch. His denunciation of the effect of this system on sexual morals is the more impressive because he unites moral indignation with scientific arguments. He not only describes in plain words a state of affairs to which those who are acquainted with it generally allude in vague terms, but he shows also how disastrously a low standard of sex morality may and often does react upon general mental and moral development. For further particulars we cannot do better than refer to the book itself.[1] It is hardly necessary to add that the author includes Co-education in his list of essential reforms.

[1] "An Introduction to the Study of Adoleseence."

Lest we should seem to harp exclusively upon the topic of sexual evil as a result of the monastic system, it will be as well to note that the system is open to criticism from other, if not wholly unrelated points of view. For example, the tendency of the Public School to produce a somewhat undifferentiated type has frequently been noted both by inside and outside observers. As Mr Paton has written, " I admit also that there are dangers in the intense social life of the school. Ground in the social mill the angles are sometimes too much rubbed down, and individualities are made too much to conform to type—a type, too, of a limited kind." [1] The result is a character which; whatever its intrinsic merits, shows little mercy to anything which deviates from its own *soi-disant* perfection. That loyalty to common ideals, which is so good a thing in itself, becomes positively harmful when the common ideals are narrow ; for it leads to a substitution of the conventional for the spontaneous and so suppresses originality. The importance of correcting this natural limitation is enhanced by the high place that English ideas assign to self-government in school. This means that the boys of an English Public School form a community in whose life the staff have little real share ; and, where so much depends upon the boys themselves, the particular philosophy of life, which they evolve under these conditions, is of some moment ; because, whatever characteristic defects it may have cannot easily be remedied from without, but must be counteracted

[1] " English Public Schools."

by influences which work from within the charmed circle itself.

The tendency to an exaggerated uniformity is, we think, clearly a result of monastic conditions, with the absence of feminine influence, which these involve. In the ethical ideal, which arises in a society of boys, there are, as we have seen, bound to be grave deficiencies. The purely physical side of life tends naturally to predominate; and the resultant code of conduct, largely conventional as it is, is strengthened in its hold by the force of custom and habit of conformity thereto, which prevail among boys and prevent the free development of wider ideals. Even if we were to admit that the cultivation of intellectual interest and of a high standard of sex morality makes under all conditions a considerable demand upon boy nature, we should still hold that the difficulties are enhanced by that "tyranny of the norm" which monastic conditions seem to impose upon the growth of ideals among boys.

It must be admitted that our emphasis on the value of corporate life in the school too often carries with it a disposition on the part of those in authority to neglect the individual. And while we are doubtless right in attaching a high value to the social side of school organisation, we perhaps exaggerate the extent to which its inherent advantages are bound up with the conventional code of conduct, which the society in question usually sets up for itself. There are, however, tendencies in modern education which represent a reaction against this suppression of

individuality, tendencies which should weaken our respect for the convention, and lead to greater freedom and variety in school life; for they are teaching us that the free development of the individual enriches, not diminishes, the life of the community.

But in their judgments about these matters people are very apt to confuse the essential and the accidental. They are very jealous, for example, to preserve the "Public School spirit"; but when they speculate on the difference which the introduction of girls into the Public School would make, they are not sufficiently analytical.

It is recognised that the change cannot be without its effect on the ideals and outlook of the boy, and it is immediately assumed that feminine influence is bound to act in the direction of what Professor Stanley Hall calls a "subtle eviration." The ground of this conclusion is the undoubted fact that difference in physical strength and the degree of importance assigned to it is a characteristic difference between the sexes. But whether or no this difference will operate in the way suggested is clearly a question to be decided, not by *a priori* reasoning, but by the surer test of experience. One thing which experience teaches is that the presence of girls does have a real and appreciable effect upon the boy's view of life, even though he be quite unconscious of the influence; you do not get quite the same kind of ethical code among the boys of a co-educational school as you find in the separate school. The fallacy of the objector

who fears for the ideal of manliness, which is at present supposed to be the product of the separate school system, lies in his assumption that this ideal is of necessity bound up with the limited and conventional code with which it is as a matter of fact associated in schoolboy behaviour. It has always seemed to us that the ideal of the Public School boy, as reflected, for example, in the works of Rudyard Kipling, loses rather than gains by the artificiality of its outward embodiment and expression. What is good in that ideal is rooted in natural instincts of boyhood ; and while it may be true that it needs the stimulus of a corporate life for its development, it does not necessarily depend upon the particular form of corporate life which is provided by the monastic institution.

Broadly speaking, we may say that there are three influences in school life which develop the hardy instincts of boyhood and its sense of personal honour. There is, firstly, the discipline of the school, which is a question of the relations partly between masters and boys, and partly between older and younger boys themselves ; there is, secondly, the institution of organised games ; and thirdly, there is the mutual influence of boys living a common social life.

With regard to the two first of these it is a simple fact that there is not the slightest reason why the introduction of Co-education should have any "softening" influence. Those who have had experience of co-educational schools know that, although there is of course a mixed staff, every

member of which, irrespective of sex, has a general authority over both boys and girls, the discipline of boys in practice depends still almost entirely upon the masters, and that of girls upon the mistresses. The presence of women among his colleagues does not, as a matter of fact, impart a feminine touch to the master's relations with boys. One may take as an example the question of corporal punishment. It seems to us that this salutary method of correction and the respect, if not affection, with which it is regarded by the average Public School boy, represent one of the finest traditions of the English Public School; and we should be very sorry if any condemnation of it were associated with Co-education, for there is no necessary connection between the two things. The tradition unfortunately is, as things are, almost a monopoly of the Public Schools; the newer type of school, which has come in with public secondary education, does not understand and rarely practises it. But it is important to note that the opposition to it does not come from feminine influence, but is rather a by-product of those exaggerated and foolish ideas as to what constitutes personal dignity which are usually associated with the advance of democracy.

This attitude of the English schoolboy to corporal punishment is not an accidental characteristic, but symbolises an attitude towards discipline and the rules of an ordered common life, which is an important element in the development of civic character, and is the basis of that idealisation of the Public School man

as an Imperial pioneer which figures so largely in the defence of the system. We have already said that Co-education, as we conceive it, is not a policy of destruction or of innovation alone. And at no point would we wish more to emphasise our sense of the value of historical continuity than when dealing with this question of the traditional attitude of English schoolboys to discipline. In this tradition we have a manifest advantage over America ; and we may note that many demerits which critics attribute to American Co-education are clearly due to the absence of this tradition. That in America the influence of women should tend still further to disintegrate a sense of discipline which is already weak is possible, but it is a danger remote from English conditions. It is forgotten by those, who fear the effects of Co-education in this vital particular, that among the classes from whom Public School boys are drawn the traditions of Public School life are accepted as right by both parents alike and by relatives of either sex. One does not find the mothers, sisters or aunts of Public School boys objecting to corporal punishment or to the prefectorial system ; and it is certainly not our experience that the women who are on the staffs of co-educational schools are in the least degree favourable to a lowering of the disciplinary standard for boys. On the working of the prefectorial system in the co-educational school we shall have something to say later.

To turn to the question of organised games—nothing perhaps is so significant of the fatuous ignorance which distinguishes the attitude of the English

public to the question of Co-education as the frequency of the *naïf* inquiry, whether boys and girls aged from fourteen to eighteen play cricket or football together. It is a solemn fact that there are people otherwise of normal mentality who cloud their minds with unnecessary horror because of a fantastic supposition that the cricket eleven of a co-educational school must needs contain a petticoated bowler, or that the boy, who reads Latin together with girls from twelve to one, is thereby incapacitated for playing football without girls from two to three. There is hardly less absurdity in the theory that even with separate games the presence of girls in the school will diminish or destroy the keenness of boys. Were no appeal to experience possible, it would not require much knowledge of boy nature to conclude that the presence of girls on the touch-line during a football match is no real incentive to slackness ; neither need one imagine that boys will be less willing to turn out on a cold November day, because it is possible that girls are spending the afternoon with their feet upon the fender. No one will seriously suggest that a cricket match on the last day of term with boys batting left-handed against girls, who bring both hands to the work, will have any permanently emasculatory results ; or that occasional co-educational tennis in the summer will sap the foundations of masculine virtue. But we have kept the most damaging admission to the last. For we cannot disguise the terrible truth that it is no uncommon sight in the co-educational school to see boys and

girls between the ages of three and ten indulging—and that, mark you, together—in the poisonous pleasures of basket-ball. . . . Tell it not in Eton; publish it not in the streets of Harrow!

But the real strength of the quite sincere opposition to Co-education, which comes from some Public School men, lies in the vague fear that it will, if introduced, destroy that indefinable quality of Public School life which is yet felt as so real a thing—the sense of a corporate existence and ideal, whose claims transcend the transitoriness of individual ambition or momentary impulse, and teach the value of service and loyalty to a common cause. It is argued that the unity of the school's life, which is necessary if this quality is to result, will be broken in upon by the admission of the other sex; some would say it is only possible among boys between none of whom there is any great difference of age. We are told—and of course there is truth in the statement—that between boys and girls relations cannot be so intimate or so entirely confidential as between boys alone; that boys and girls pursue different interests and look towards different ideals; in particular that girls are more individualist—have not that love for a corporate life or that capability of living it to the full which characterise boys. Again, while the fact of sex is of no great importance before adolescence, its influence during that period is such that it cannot be disregarded in the relationship of boys and girls. While companionship between them is not impossible, it is argued that the consciousness of sex distinction

will bring with it a sense of artificiality, and either the resultant relationship will be so slight as to be devoid of serious value, or it will take a sentimental form, or, worse still, produce a state of sexual excitement harmful to both alike. In any case little would seem to be gained and much lost. The unity of the school's life would be destroyed, and with the unity the power of that life to mould the individual. The virile tone, which marks the relations of boys to each other, must of necessity be softened in the mutual relation of the sexes ; and it is supposed that the gentler fashion will prevail throughout the school, that courtesy must needs degenerate into effeminacy, and that a degree of reserve is incompatible with the confidence which should accompany true friendships. There is no end to the theoretical dangers of such a situation, and no limit to the pessimism of those whose imagination conjures them up.

The only conclusive answer to these speculations is that provided by experience. Experience shows that the unity of a school's life is not really dependent upon so artificial a condition as the exclusion of one of the sexes. For an institution to have a corporate life in which all its members share does not necessitate that its members should all be of one sex, any more than it demands that they should all be of one age. The family is a unity, in spite of disparity of sex and age. So too—although we would not press the analogy too far—is the co-educational school. It is quite true that the distinction of sex makes a difference in the school

which is not felt in the family ; that boys and girls are more intimate and confidential with members of their own sex than with each other, when they live together as well as when they live apart. And yet the relations between boys and girls in the co-educational school are not such as are usually imagined by theorists, who lack practical acquaintance with the conditions. There is, as might be expected, a certain reserve between the sexes differing in degree according to age and temperament. In the pre-adolescent period boys and girls meet very much on equal terms ; nor does the divergence of interests, arising from such facts as the greater muscular development of the boy, lead to mutual indifference or contempt. With the approach and during the early stages of adolescence—which begins earlier for the girl than for the boy—there is naturally a more pronounced tendency to reserve in the presence of the other sex, and a greater measure of voluntary segregation than before. In the mid-adolescent period boys and girls begin to take a more definite interest in each other, and this is the stage for the appearance of those idealistic attachments which are occasionally found in the co-educational school ; it is also perhaps the stage at which, whether with, or, as is more often the case, without the addition of a consciously romantic element in the relationship, boys and girls exert the most beneficial influence on each other. The intercourse of boys and girls during the last years of school life, when they are between the ages of seventeen and nineteen, is—if we may trust our own experience—less liable than in immedi-

ately preceding years to be disturbed by the intrusion of Romance, whether genuine or artificial. This is the stage at which both social intercourse and individual companionship and friendship are most free and unreserved. The development of sex differences has passed the critical stage, and in the calmer atmosphere which supervenes boys and girls are more in a position to recognise and appreciate complementary values in each other. There is no limit to the logical hair-splitting which is possible around the question whether dissimilarities do or do not form a sound *a priori* basis for sympathy. But practical experience in this field at least gives a definitely affirmative answer.

There is one point deserving of attention here which is generally ignored by those who speculate on the dangers of Co-education. It is assumed that in their circle of acquaintance and friendship boys and girls are far more confined to individuals of their own age and standing than is, as a matter of fact, the case. While boys and girls are naturally thrown more into the company of those of their own form or "set" than into that of others, there is, in a properly organised school, sufficient stimulus and opportunity in the varied forms of common activity, serious or otherwise, which supplement actual school work, to ensure constant intercourse between boys and girls of different age and standing. If there be an "awkward age" during which the boys and girls, whose passage through it happens to coincide, tend in some degree to shun each other, it must be remembered that the reserve in question is not necessarily felt towards the

whole of the opposite sex ; and as a matter of fact the proportion of individuals concerned at any given time is not sufficiently large to create any noticeable segregation in the school. In fine, while it is quite natural and desirable that boys and girls should to some extent live separate lives, and at certain times and seasons should shun rather than seek each other, the necessities of the case are yet far from being such as to create a real division in the life of the school. The truth is that, when all admissions have been made, the divergence of interests which the sex distinction makes between boy and girl has been much exaggerated. Between the youth of either sex there are in effect more bonds of sympathy than grounds for antipathy. There is a natural community of feeling between all who are *in statu pupillari* under the same conditions ; and there is little room for permanent antagonism between those who in the vicissitudes of a school's life must so often rejoice or weep together. The result of a scholarship examination, or of a cricket match, the event of any contest in which the honour or the reputation of the school as a whole is engaged, are awaited by boys and girls alike with no discernible difference of zeal ; while half-holidays or detentions are welcomed or deplored by both, with feelings which provide no materials for the psychology of sex. If it be the case (and even this is doubtful) that girls on the whole display less capacity for corporate life and less initiative in corporate activity than boys, it is certain that they have a larger capacity for sympathising with and entering into

what is due to the initiative and activity of others. This greater depth of sympathy is a prerogative of the sex ; and there is one way especially in which it contributes to the unity and reality of the school's life. Throughout history men have been great in action, women in feeling ; and adolescence is the period when feeling develops and seeks expression in its most valuable forms. Whereas the adolescent boy expresses himself rather in outward activity, the girl at the like stage lives by inward ideals. She has an unlimited capacity for devotion, centring, it may be, upon a nascent maternal instinct, but universal in its range, and manifesting itself as easily and as whole-heartedly in loyalty to an institution as in enthusiasm for an ideal personality. This is why there is, as it seems to us, something more of real altruism in the loyalty of a girl to her school than in that of a boy. So far then as the essence of the Public School spirit lies in its attribute of loyalty to an institution, we cannot see that the presence of girls in a school involves anything but gain.

We have already said that much of the divergence which there is between the ideals of boy and girl is due to the boy's greater absorption in muscular growth, and consequent inclination to more vigorous forms of recreation and self-expression. But physical development is not confined to one sex, and certain of its psychical reactions are common to both sexes. That *joie-de-vivre* which, arising from a sense of physical well-being, manifests itself in "animal spirits," is an attribute of youth irrespective of sex ;

so too is delight in the active side of life, although, as we have noted, this is tempered in the case of the girl to an avoidance of those exaggerations, which often mark it in the boy—a qualification, the example of which is not without its subtle effect on the latter. Again, boys and girls are in some small degree drawn together by their distinction of themselves from the staff. The adolescent in the exuberance of his or her youth feels, if not an absolute, at least a partial superiority over the disillusioned adult.

The life of a school, with its common purposes and ideals, and its continuity of tradition, is a thing which transcends easily the difference of sex. The boys of a co-educational school do not find "the honour of the school" an ideal any the less worth striving for because girls share in it. As no one person obviously can speak from a full experience of both systems, complete comparison is not possible. But to those, whether boys or girls, who have passed through a co-educational school there seems something lacking in the ideal of the separate school. Where boys and girls are together, the content of their common life is fuller and more varied than their lives apart can be. There is a greater diversity of gifts, a wider range for the interplay of character upon character, and scope for the development and exercise of qualities in both sexes, which are necessarily dormant in a unisexual environment. The store of experience which boys and girls carry away from such a school, and upon which memory draws in later years, when it conjures up an ideal of the past to reverence, is the

richer and the more valuable because it is, in its variety and completeness, a replica in little of the things which are essential in the fuller life of the adult world. To sum up the argument of these last pages in a sentence, we are convinced that, in all that relates to the influence of the community upon the individual, the co-educational school, as compared with others, not only does not lose, but positively gains in richness, variety and power.

To define in exact terms the precise way in which the social environment of the co-educational school affects the boy is not easy. But it may be said that the chief educational significance of this influence lies in the provision it makes for the right development of the emotional side of boy nature. To this provision is due that quality of ease and naturalness which outside as well as inside observers note as characteristic of the co-educational as contrasted with the separate school. The segregation of boys produces a kind of sex strain, which at the best is decidedly unhealthy, and at the worst, as we have seen, leads to accentuation or perversion of the sexual impulse. The mixing of the sexes, on the other hand, provides in the ordinary intercourse of a common life a natural outlet for emotion, which is none the less valuable because the boy or girl may through familiarity become almost unconscious of its existence. The absence of sex strain, and the presence of a vaguely felt emotional quality in his social life, and, to some extent, his individual relationships is of the utmost

importance, if the boy is to attain a harmonious development of every side of his nature. We do not of course say that the mingling of the sexes at all times or under all circumstances will produce ideal results ; but to those, who have seen Co-education under varying conditions, experience brings a conviction that there is in the system itself a saving grace which militates powerfully against accidental and external difficulties. Granted conditions which are not really difficult to obtain, the result of bringing boys and girls together is to create an atmosphere, in which the presence of an emotional element—such as is really inseparable from the relation between the sexes—does not imply, as it so often does under monastic conditions, morbidity or unwholesome sentiment.

It is strange that opponents of Co-education often imagine that our case rests on a disregard of the importance of the emotional life. It is less often perhaps that the Public School is defended on the ground that it does what we are accused of neglecting, but what is in reality one of our chief aims. Professor Welton, however, writes, " The deepening of the emotional life, including a higher evaluation of all social relationships is the most important characteristic of this period. . . . Probably the Public School with its well-organised games and its absence of sentimentality of tone is, provided the moral atmosphere be pure, as good an environment as an adolescent boy can have." [1] We suggest that the " higher evaluation of

[1] " The Psychology of Education," p. 232.

all social relationships" is impossible without the presence of the sex which constitutes one half of society. We question whether the "absence of sentimentality of tone," under monastic conditions, is always a healthy sign, and not sometimes a deceptive appearance due to the tendency to suppress all sentiment, good or bad. As for Professor Welton's conditional clause, we doubt whether it is right to perpetuate an educational system by which, on the admission of those who work that system, the provision in question is rendered more difficult than it would otherwise be.

It is, however, as we have already indicated, on more particular grounds than the general importance of a proper development of the emotional life that we advocate Co-education. If Co-education had no other merit whatsoever; if, on the contrary, it really suffered from the drawbacks which are attributed to it, we should still hold it vastly superior to the separate system, in that it has been proved by experience to contain within itself the best natural safeguard for both boy and girl against those dangers, which in the development of sex attend the transition from childhood to manhood and womanhood. In our view of the good and evil of school life, our judgment is biased by the conventional reticence which precludes full discussion of the problems of sex morality. But those who see things in their right proportion are well aware that these are the gravest problems arising out of and affecting school life; as indeed they are the gravest problems in the life

of society as a whole. The case for Co-education in a sentence is that, whereas the separate system admittedly conduces in itself to sexual evil, the co-educational system in itself is directly favourable to the growth of purity. That parents and teachers alike are awakening to the need for more positive guarantees of sex morality than our present arrangements afford is shown by *e.g.* the growing demand for a stricter censorship of books and cinematograph performances; and more importantly still, by the increasing recognition of parental duty in the matter of sex instruction. But such reforms, while altogether desirable in themselves, touch but a small part of the child's environment. The most important element in that environment is of course the human element, represented mostly by his schoolfellows. It is therefore impracticable to expect any great advance in the sex morality of children—or of society, which is recruited from them—so long as the factor of school life is not seriously taken into account. The greatest obstacle to thorough reform is the tacit assumption that the evil influences of school life are necessary evils, and cannot be got rid of without abolishing the school. But theoretically at least it is plain that evils arising from monastic conditions may be altered by the abolition of the monastic element. The question which falls to be discussed, and settled in the only possible way, by experiment, is whether Co-education does in effect abolish those evils, and that without substituting other and worse in their stead.

Experience shows that Co-education automatically

abolishes the sex strain which is at the root of the evil in separate schools, and puts in its place a positive influence which is potent on the side of purity. The simple fact is that if you take a hundred boys and a hundred girls from normally good homes and environment and educate them apart, you cannot guarantee an ideal standard of sex morality; whilst the presence of a single infecting element may do untold harm before it is discovered. If, on the other hand, you educate them together, you will find that not only does the presence of boys correct what may be wrong in the moral balance of the girls, but the presence of girls will prove powerful enough under normal conditions to abolish the much more insistent and pernicious sex strain which arises among boys, when alone; and to substitute for it a healthy and wholesome atmosphere making directly for purity. The latter result, though at first sight far the greater achievement of the two, is not really surprising. For the influence of the feminine sex on the side of purity has always been one of the strongest forces working for good in the world. And the force which works with effect in face of the difficulties of the outside world works more easily and effectively still under the conditions of school life. The girl's nature is cast in a finer mould than that of the boy. With her sex, if less insistent, is more pervasive, and destined normally to play a larger part in her future career; she is therefore instinctively more in touch with the deeper issues of life. In the relationship between the sexes there is on her side more dignity, more reserve

and greater discretion. There is a significance in that use of language (however indefensible) which suggests that the honour of a man is something to which conduct in matters of sex stands in little or no relation ; whereas the honour of a woman is held to consist in nothing more than in her purity in that regard—a distinction reflected in the attitude of society, wholly indefensible by any plea of abstract justice, which visits with so much greater condemnation an error in the latter case than in the former. For all these reasons the serious aspect of sex life, which boys perhaps do not grasp fully till early manhood, or later still, is borne in at a much earlier period upon the girl. And if it be allowed that the normal attitude of the girl is partly expressive of an instinct of self-preservation, it will be easily understood that there is less danger of relaxation under co-educational than under other conditions. The presence of boys puts the girl upon her dignity, and constant intercourse with them calls for the exercise of a continual discretion ; while it also makes demands upon the sympathetic side of her nature, whose fulfilment prevents morbid introspection, while it gives some scope for the natural exercise of a duly restrained emotion.

The aid which the presence of girls lends to the solution of the most pressing moral difficulties of boyhood is twofold. In the first place, the difficulties themselves are rendered less acute by the disappearance of the strain inherent in monastic conditions; and

secondly, the remedy is the more effective because it substitutes something definite in the place of what it prohibits. For the instrument of good in this case is no abstract prohibition standing out of relation to the ordinary routine of life, but a concrete and positive ideal of behaviour, whose demands in one way or another make themselves felt every day. The difficulties are less acute because the artificial sex strain peculiar to monastic institutions disappears in the natural and wholesome intercourse of boys and girls in and out of school, giving place to a social atmosphere which has its own emotional quality, and so obviates the danger of those excessive outbreaks, which tend to occur when the emotional life is altogether driven underground. In regard to the second point, it is *a priori* probable that a boy's ideal of womanhood, and consequently his value judgments in the matter of sex morality will be saner, healthier and more in accordance with reality, if he lives on terms of easy and familiar intercourse with members of the opposite sex, than if he has to depend on such airy abstractions as his imagination can construct from a mixture of ignorance and curiosity. Femininity in the concrete, as represented by beings who prove to be a good deal more than mere embodiments of a sex opposite to his own, who are found in fact to share to a large extent his own interests and sympathies, is an excellent corrective to those morbid exaggerations, which vacillate dangerously between the equally undesirable extremes of the vaguely angelic and the frankly animal. Not even the former

of these extremes commands any real respect; and in sex morality respect for the other sex and self-respect are closely allied. But the girl in the co-educational school does command the respect of the boy and commands it for her sex. The high ideal of the purity and sacredness of sex, which belongs to her by nature, tends to communicate itself to the boy through the attraction of her personality. Boys in such a school are no more than those in another given to admitting openly susceptibility to feminine influence —whether of a romantic kind or not. But the susceptibility is there, and is the channel of much that is perhaps given as unconsciously as it is received. While in regard to matters—such as athletics—which concern his own sex a good deal more than the other, the boy will remain unaffected by feminine estimates (assuming these to differ from his own), on the whole question of sex itself, and the relationships it involves, an isolation of standpoint is clearly less easy and less likely. In regard to this region of conduct the boy can find no reason why his standards should necessarily be right and those of the girl necessarily wrong. And if he accepts a lower standard of sex morality than that he knows to be cherished by the girl, he is, more definitely than in a monastic institution, sinning against the light. While it is doubtless true that in the whole range of wrong-doing this is the category hardest to deal with, it is also true that, if all sin due to an *absence* of light were abolished, the burden of evil, whether in the school or in the world at large, would be much lessened.

secondly, the remedy is the more effective because it substitutes something definite in the place of what it prohibits. For the instrument of good in this case is no abstract prohibition standing out of relation to the ordinary routine of life, but a concrete and positive ideal of behaviour, whose demands in one way or another make themselves felt every day. The difficulties are less acute because the artificial sex strain peculiar to monastic institutions disappears in the natural and wholesome intercourse of boys and girls in and out of school, giving place to a social atmosphere which has its own emotional quality, and so obviates the danger of those excessive outbreaks, which tend to occur when the emotional life is altogether driven underground. In regard to the second point, it is *a priori* probable that a boy's ideal of womanhood, and consequently his value judgments in the matter of sex morality will be saner, healthier and more in accordance with reality, if he lives on terms of easy and familiar intercourse with members of the opposite sex, than if he has to depend on such airy abstractions as his imagination can construct from a mixture of ignorance and curiosity. Femininity in the concrete, as represented by beings who prove to be a good deal more than mere embodiments of a sex opposite to his own, who are found in fact to share to a large extent his own interests and sympathies, is an excellent corrective to those morbid exaggerations, which vacillate dangerously between the equally undesirable extremes of the vaguely angelic and the frankly animal. Not even the former

of these extremes commands any real respect; and in sex morality respect for the other sex and self-respect are closely allied. But the girl in the co-educational school does command the respect of the boy and commands it for her sex. The high ideal of the purity and sacredness of sex, which belongs to her by nature, tends to communicate itself to the boy through the attraction of her personality. Boys in such a school are no more than those in another given to admitting openly susceptibility to feminine influence —whether of a romantic kind or not. But the susceptibility is there, and is the channel of much that is perhaps given as unconsciously as it is received. While in regard to matters—such as athletics—which concern his own sex a good deal more than the other, the boy will remain unaffected by feminine estimates (assuming these to differ from his own), on the whole question of sex itself, and the relationships it involves, an isolation of standpoint is clearly less easy and less likely. In regard to this region of conduct the boy can find no reason why his standards should necessarily be right and those of the girl necessarily wrong. And if he accepts a lower standard of sex morality than that he knows to be cherished by the girl, he is, more definitely than in a monastic institution, sinning against the light. While it is doubtless true that in the whole range of wrong-doing this is the category hardest to deal with, it is also true that, if all sin due to an *absence* of light were abolished, the burden of evil, whether in the school or in the world at large, would be much lessened.

claim, it renders to the purity of boyhood. It is easier, no doubt, to gain the assent of thoughtful observers to the wide extent of this evil than to define it for those who would shut their eyes to its existence. It shows itself in the greater part of the novels, plays and other writings of the modern woman, and of the books and plays which the modern woman cares to read and see. It is in its essence a grotesque error in values, placing the husk before the kernel, the temporary before the lasting. It is not inconsistent with a fond dabbling either in the forms of the old religion or in those fantastic substitutes which masquerade under some such name as theosophy. In the girl it replaces reverence by curiosity and interest by excitement. She cares more for what is being said than for what is being done, and is concerned with the impression she produces rather than with the development in herself of true power. She is self-conscious and unnatural, and her conversation imitative and forced. Perhaps the disease of which these are the symptoms may be briefly diagnosed as absorption, not in what mankind is and needs, but in what male-kind appears to be and like. Now here is a disease, ruinous to the victim and grievously harmful to the body social, which is both directly fostered by unnatural segregation and securely banished by the influence of boy companions. What can be more inevitable than that girls, feeling themselves cut off by the express policy of their elders from natural intercourse with that other sex which is bound to play so important a part in

their after life, should turn to those of their contemporaries who profess a knowledge of the subject? Or what more certain than that the ideas so obtained will be wholly false and misleading? Only those most ignorant of boy and girl nature will suppose that the influence of mistresses, however strong in some directions, will prevail in such a matter over the *dicta* of an assertive contemporary. One might as well expect a boy to trust his headmaster's judgment in the matter of the colour of his socks, or a girl to model her desires in hair-ribbons upon the taste of her form-mistress. In this, as in so many other matters, the atmosphere of the school is the only thing that counts, and wise teachers have discovered long since that they are unable (and should only most indirectly attempt) to impose an atmosphere. Nor does this cult of false values betray itself in a way which affords to authority any means of judging its extent. It is not inconsistent with all the outward signs of amenableness to school rules, and, though it does undoubtedly play havoc with intellectual progress, this consequent failure in work is only too apt to be ascribed to natural stupidity. But in the presence of boys such a false view of life and its meaning is scarcely possible. For, whatever be the faults of the average boy, this assuredly is not one of them. There is no mystery about him, nor is he tolerant of mystery in others. He may be reticent to a fault about his ideas of life and duty, or he may fail very obviously in carrying them out, but he can and does show very plainly his contempt for the kind of

nonsense which turns an occasional boy into a caricature of the man about town, or makes of a girl a self-conscious dupe of inanities. Boys have many other ways of helping their girl companions, but, were this the only service they rendered, it would more than justify the "risk" of sending our daughters to co-educational schools.

It should, however, be understood that boys and girls are not at the time very conscious of the influence which they exert upon each other. Where the inexperienced adult goes hopelessly wrong, when he tries to realise the conditions of life in a co-educational school, is in assigning to the factor of sex in the relations of boys and girls far too much of the significance which it has in the relationship of men and women. It seems to us that most of the works which deal with adolescence exaggerate, we can hardly say the part which sex plays in that period, for that can scarcely be exaggerated, but the extent to which the adolescent is conscious of the connection between his sexual development and his general mental and physical growth. The truth is that on this question of sex there is a great deal too much morbid thought and morbid writing. The critic forgets that boys and girls at school are not introspective psychologists. In the full life of a properly organised school, with its constant round of varied occupation, boys and girls find little temptation to morbid reflection. Unless indeed they are handicapped by unnatural and unfavourable conditions, they have little tendency in that direction. We may take it, for

example, as an observed fact of sex psychology, that sex attraction in adolescence, given its appropriate object, finds its characteristic form not in desire but in devotion. The mistake, which so often vitiates the critic's mental picture of the co-educational school, is his assumption that boys and girls regard each other under those conditions in the way in which they do, as a matter of fact, tend to regard each other when they are kept apart. Whereas the truth is rather that sex, instead of acting as an ever-present centre of disturbance, is practically taken for granted.

It is only natural that the mixture of the sexes should impose a restraint on thought, word and action when boys and girls are actually together.[1] What is more important is that this restraint operates upon boys when they are—as they must often of course be in a co-educational as in another school—apart from

[1] " But hence follows a rule for the twelfth or fifteenth year, that time of revolution and evolution, when the soul steps from one world into another : *Mix the Sexes*, if you would raise them. The presence of two boys among twelve girls or of two girls among twelve boys is a fortress and a cloister that shall effectively guard the twelve against every unseemliness of word and gesture."—Richter's " Levana, " c. 4, § 127 (see Appendix A).
Our experience leads us to prefer this view of the matter to that expressed, for example, by Mr John Naughton of Harrogate, in a paper on the " Dangers of Co-education," reproduced in *Secondary Education*, 16th January 1911:
" . . . the floodgates of evil may be opened wide . . . if you throw the two sexes together in one class, where the ages and intellectual attainments are on a par, all checks and safeguards are thrown to the winds."

girls. The fact is that the conventional code of ethics, which arises of itself in a juvenile community, is the product in a co-educational school not of the boys alone, but to some extent also of the girls—although neither may be very clearly aware of the fact. And herein lies the peculiar value of Co-education considered simply as a remedy for impurity among boys. For amongst those who, whatever be the character of the authority under which they are placed, will still rule their conduct very largely by conventions of their own, it is a great matter to enlist convention on the right side. All schoolmasters realise that to do this under the conditions of ordinary Public School life is a desperately hard thing. It is infinitely easier under Co-education, because the driving force comes from within instead of from without.

We do not deny that there are other ways in which it is possible to appeal from the "lower" to the "higher" nature of a boy. It remains true that the religious appeal is the most powerful appeal—when it can be made to work. But that it cannot always be made to work in face of the peculiar obstacles of monastic school life there is much sad experience to prove. We do not wish here to enter upon the very difficult question how far it is possible or desirable to *impose* religion in school life, but this much at least may be said—that among the boys of a nation which is marked by an excessive reticence on religious subjects the danger is ever present that religious observances and the religious life, when regulated by rules externally imposed, may degenerate

into empty formalism; and that, if religion is to exercise a real influence on conduct, it is vital not only to emphasise the religious aspect of all conduct, but also to appeal further to what are not explicitly religious motives in order to bridge more easily that gulf which, whether we like it or not, does lie very often between the innermost religious feelings of a boy and his ordinary everyday life. If you can by natural instead of forced means bring about the inclusion of purity in the schoolboy's code of honour, you will avail yourself of a powerful ally; you will at once increase the force of the religious appeal, and effect a truer unity in the boy's spiritual life. And to this result we are convinced that Co-education tends.

This reference to religion suggests another result of Co-education. It is a commonplace that religion is a real thing to far more women than men. There are many men who scoff at religion, but there must be very few women. Similarly the religious appeal affects the average girl more powerfully than the average boy. Schoolmasters know the harm which can be done by a few boys who mock at religion; we cannot remember to have met with a single girl who either mocked herself or willingly listened to the mockery of others. Now we are not going to maintain that the mere presence of girls is enough to banish entirely every cynical word or thought from a school, or to prevent altogether the pathetic folly of juvenile agnosticism. Nevertheless the influence of girls in the school is on the side of true religion, and we have seen

it make itself felt in many subtle ways, through corporate action or feeling as well as along more individual lines.

The mere presence of girls at the religious services of a school has important effects. If it be granted that boys for various reasons are more liable than girls to inattention and irreverence, it will not be disputed that the constant example of a deeper reverence and a more real devotion than their own is a valuable help. A boy's religion is a difficult thing to deal with. It is an unfortunate fact that the virtue of " piety " has unpleasant associations in his mind. His limited experience connects it with a degree of sentimentality and moral flabbiness which conflicts with his ideal of healthy-mindedness. And although the association is altogether unnecessary and, if our teaching and practice of religion were more successful, would not be found at all, the suspicion of it constitutes a formidable stumbling-block in the way of true religion in schools. The case of the girl is not the same. So far from suggesting hypocrisy or morbidity, a devotional spirit in his girl friends is regarded by the boy as a natural attribute commanding his respect. And there is a simple reason for this. In this, as in other ways, the girl matures earlier than the boy ; moreover, the inner life is at all times a more real thing to her ; and she can admit and exhibit depths of feeling, pretence to which might appear—and often signify—nothing more than affectation in the average boy. Her influence in this direction is similar to that she wields in the sphere of sex morality. Her example as

compared with that of adults of either sex is more powerful to move the boy, because he still regards her as an equal. Moral superiority has most effect when it proceeds from similar age and equal standing.

But the effects of the presence of girls on sex morality and on religion are but instances, as it seems to us, of an influence which has a still wider range, although its most valuable results are in just those directions. From his constant intercourse with girls in and out of school the boy, we think, gains at an earlier age than is otherwise usual a serious view of the meaning and possibilities of life. To a width of interest, which is the natural characteristic of a temperament delighting in outward expression, he adds a greater depth and intensity acquired in association with those the current of whose life sets inward rather than outward, and is thus in a fairer way to attain that perfect balance of faculties and ripeness of judgment which is one end of education. The analogy will perhaps appear fanciful, but we cannot refrain from parenthetically hinting a connection between this blending of the distinctive psychical qualities of the sexes, considered as a necessary element in ideal education, and that union of the "intelligent" and the "instinctive," which M. Bergson has set before us as the possible key to the riddle of human thought and the meaning of human life.

In the last chapter we remarked incidentally that boys and girls must often laugh together. Which reminds us that no account of a social life is complete

without a reference to the place therein of humour. Someone has said that the best cement of friendship is a common taste in jokes. At any rate laughter, for all its superficiality, is one of the subtlest means the human spirit has fashioned to express sympathy. "Laughter," says M. Bergson, "always implies a kind of secret freemasonry." Now it has often occurred to us that there is a great difference—of kind rather than of degree—between the sense of humour of men and of women. This it is which in part (we think) gives to the atmosphere of a drawing-room full of mixed company a sense of strain which is absent from the smoking-room and, presumably, the boudoir. One of Meredith's characters says of men and women: "They have not the same standard of honour. They might have it from an education in common." For honour, write "humour"—would the sentence still stand? We do not know. But this at least we hold from experience to be true: that the difference in this regard is much less between boys and girls. They may still see the funny side of things from different standpoints—glimpse different facets of the comic—but they appreciate each other's view more easily. As for differences—the more the merrier is a maxim clearly applying! Seriously, we consider the *camaraderie* of the sexes not a little helped by the spirit of laughter—the funnier here for being double-faced. Consider it as you will, with M. Bergson as indicative of "a slight revolt on the surface of social life," or more simply with old Hobbes as "sudden glory," laughter is an electric shock to dispel

restraint; a mighty solvent, too, of boredoms and all the *blasé* brood. It knits together a heterogeneous community by bonds of subtle and lighthearted sympathy. And once again we may discern, if we please, an interplay of forces. The girl, whose sense of humour, developed in isolation, is apt to lose itself in vapid silliness and degenerate into giggling for giggling's sake, learns sanity and restraint from the frank and open laughter of the boy ; the boy, whose natural tendencies do not always protect him from a confusion of the comic with the coarse, learns an equally valuable lesson from the severer Puritanism of feminine mirth. We are not afraid to assert that the Co-education of the Comic Muse would be a far-reaching social reform.

Lest we should appear to suggest, either in what we have hitherto said or in what remains to say, that the products of Co-education are prodigies of perfection, let us hasten to add that we write consciously in terms rather of the ideal than of the actual. But no one supposes that educational science has yet reached further than an elementary stage ; and the best we can do is to sow the seeds and make the most of what growth we can get. But whilst we wish to emphasise the promise rather than the performance of Co-education, it must be allowed that promise would not be a claim of any value unless some proofs of progress had already been registered. We think they have been.

CHAPTER IX

THE BOY AND THE GIRL (*continued*)

THUS far we have been considering the influence of girls in general upon boys in general and *vice versa*. But it is possible to particularise a little further. It is recognised that the friendships which are formed between boys in a Public School are often of great value. Such friendships, continued into later life, have indeed not seldom made history. The question is frequently asked how far friendships of a similar kind are possible between boys and girls in a co-educational school; with the implied suggestion that such relations are likely to begin and to end in nothing better than sentimentality. To this question there is no single answer which will apply to all individuals at any given age or to any one individual at all ages.

But it should be clearly understood that there is far less sentiment about the co-educational school than is generally imagined by outsiders. Most boys and girls do, as a matter of fact, prove conveniently unromantic in the presence of each other; the normal attitude is not one of sentimental attraction, but of frank and open intercourse. But of course some temperaments are more susceptible than others,

and these experience occasional phases of sentimental attraction. While we certainly take no steps to encourage these *epiphenomena* of co-educational school life, at the same time we neither raise hands of horror nor weep tears of lamentation when they occur. They are but minor incidents—molehills which are only magnified into mountains by the microscope of the psychologist or the imagination of the critic. Sometimes they are just silly and known to be silly by those involved; in which case brief life is their general portion. Or, again, they are silly but thought to be serious by at least two persons; when they may take a little longer lease. They may finally be quite serious attachments, as near to love as it is possible for boys and girls to attain. But we are bound to admit that we cannot remember any boy and girl attachment which has as yet proved serious enough to fructify into subsequent marriage. Still, the evidence is too meagre for us to dogmatise. If the thing could be represented by a statistical curve, our experience would lead us to surmise that the highest point would be touched at the stage represented by the Lower V. and Upper IV. forms; with a sudden drop to zero or thereabouts as the line approached the nascent dignity of the Upper V. or the full-blown majesty of the VI. It is an observed fact of some interest that the responsibility which rests upon the oldest boys and girls in a co-educational school, with its mixture of all ages and both sexes, proves—we will not say an invariable—but an almost invariable safeguard

against the formation among them of sentimental attachments.

If we take them at their worst, such sentimental attachments as do arise in a co-educational school are not likely to work very much harm. Where there is plenty of opportunity for open meeting, the danger of secret meeting is minimised ; and it is possible, by rules careful and simple without being oppressive, to exercise a watchful vigilance which is still exempt from suggestions of espionage. Moreover, with the disappearance of the romance which attaches to secrecy and mystery there goes more than half the charm of the adventure. We may say boldly that we are not over-anxious for the stamping-out at all costs of these affairs. For those who are temperamentally liable to them the co-educational school offers, we think, the best possible environment ; because it submits them to a kind of vaccination, and perhaps saves them from more serious trouble in the future. Not broken hearts but wiser heads are the usual outcome. We do not think that the co-educated boy is less likely than another to fall in love when he has attained the years of discretion ; but we certainly think he is more likely than others to marry the right person eventually and, having done so, to understand and appreciate her as she deserves. Apropos of this question of marriage, we cannot refrain from quoting the wise words of Robert Louis Stevenson. The quotation may be well known, but bears repetition :

" But it is the object of a liberal education not only

to obscure the knowledge of one sex by another, but to magnify the natural differences between the two. Man is a creature who lives not upon bread alone, but principally by catchwords; and the little rift between the sexes is astonishingly widened by simply teaching one set of catchwords to the girls and another to the boys. To the first, there is shown but a very small field of experience, and taught a very trenchant principle for judgment and action; to the other, the world of life is more largely displayed, and their rule of conduct is proportionally widened. They are taught to follow different virtues, to hate different vices, to place their ideal, even for each other, in different achievements. What should be the result of such a course? When a horse has run away, and the two flustered people in the gig have each possessed themselves of a rein, we know the end of that conveyance will be in the ditch. So, when I see a raw youth and a green girl, fluted and fiddled in a dancing measure into that most serious contract, and setting out upon life's journey with ideas so monstrously divergent, I am not surprised that some make shipwreck, but that any come to port. What the boy does almost proudly, as a manly peccadillo, the girl will shudder at as a debasing vice; what is to her the mere common-sense of tactics, he will spit out of his mouth as shameful. Through such a sea of contrarieties must this green couple steer their way; and continue to love each other; and to respect, forsooth; and be ready, when the time arrives, to educate the little

men and women who shall succeed to their places and perplexities." [1]

Stevenson does not suggest as a remedy that boys and girls should fall in love at school. Nor do we. But, as we said before, this side of co-educational school life looms larger in the eyes of the outside critic than of those who have practical experience of Co-education. Ordinary friendship between boy and girl is more normal and certainly more beneficial.[2] There are, as might be expected, more intimate friendships between boy and boy, and girl and girl, than between boy and girl. For, although the sexes associate much more easily and familiarly here than under other conditions, there is still a degree of reserve between them. Nevertheless boys and girls do form individual friendships with each other, and such friendships are not infrequently continued beyond school years—with one incidental result, in which we may see the thin end of the wedge of a social revolution. Between the terms of intercourse on which boys and girls live in a co-educational school and the ordinary conventions which govern the relations of young men and women in society there is a considerable gulf. And when boys and girls leave school and go out into the un-co-educated world they come unexpectedly up against conventions which in their case at least are often appallingly stupid.

[1] "Virginibus Puerisque."

[2] "L'adolescence, en effet, est l'âge de l'amitié plus encore que celui de l'amour."—Compayré, "L'Adolescence," p. 102.

Nowhere does the clash between new and old produce more curious results than at the ancient universities. There you may already find young men and women, who a few years—or months—ago discussed and settled among themselves grave questions of state at meetings quite sacrosanct from more elderly intrusion, now scarcely allowed a mutual recognition in the streets, and hardly able to venture upon a greater degree of intimacy than is implied by comments on the state of the weather, over an occasional cup of tea sweetened by the presence of a chaperon. No doubt the present state of society affords a certain justification for some of these conventions. But, when all due allowance is made, there is still a good deal of nonsense talked and practised in the name of propriety. We hedge ourselves about with the barriers of convention, and gaze at each other across a gulf of our own making. Such conduct bears its natural nemesis. For the tyranny of convention lies in just this, that when men fly for refuge to a common embodiment in law or custom of what they feel to be right, but too difficult for their several frailties alone to attain, they naturally tend to cling to the convention thus established, lest, losing hold of this, they should be cast altogether adrift. This tendency, natural in itself, becomes pernicious when the convention, being designed as a protection against some common human failing, thereby, as it were, sets an official seal of acceptance to the limitation in question. Men are prone to live up or down to the estimate which they put upon themselves. In regard

to the conventions which govern the relations of the sexes, Co-education, we trust, will help to winnow out the merely irksome from the really necessary.

It must be admitted that the strictness of convention is itself an obstacle to Co-education. The unfavourable social atmosphere thus created makes the widespread introduction of the system more difficult than it would otherwise be. *Festina lente* would be our watchword, were it not that the conservatism of the British public in any case forces that policy upon us.

Both during and after school years friendship between boy and girl is a thing of very great value. In the school itself it serves better, we think, than friendship between members of the same sex to counteract that sense of artificiality to which institutional life must always to some extent give rise. In such friendship there is more both to give and to receive on either side ; there is a natural deference between the sexes which calls for the practice of a more constant altruism ; and there is always, as we have before insisted, an emotional quality, however apparently slight, in the relation, giving to it a charm and a sense of ease which add in little indefinable ways to the pleasure and richness of life. In after years too it is a great gain for men and women to keep up their earlier friendships. We need hardly dwell on the loss which under present arrangements young men and women just entering upon the world incur, through lack of sufficient opportunity for meeting and becoming acquainted with each other. There are

not a few social evils which a freer intercourse between the sexes, based upon the foundation of a previous common life, might be expected to remedy. If in the future women are destined to take a larger share in public and professional life than they take at present, no aspect of co-educational school life is more socially valuable than the frequent co-operation of boys and girls in activities beyond the range of ordinary school work. We have already alluded to the prefectorial system. The delegation of responsibility to older boys is one of the most valuable features of the Public School system. To be held responsible for others is a training not only in leadership, but also in self-discipline. To share responsibility with others of one's own age teaches the necessity of compromise, and corrects the bias of personal judgment. There is no loss in this regard under Co-education. Boy prefects exercise authority over boys alone, and girl prefects over girls. In both cases there is a call for the exercise of more diversified forms of control than is usual in the separate school, owing to the mixture of all ages which is found in the co-educational school. It may be easier for prefects to exercise authority over the very young than over older children ; but the burden of responsibility is proportionally greater. In dealing with those who have little independence, the necessity of setting a good example is the more pressing ; and this necessity, as we have already suggested, acts as a constant stimulus to the oldest children. Again, although they do not trespass on each other's sphere, boy and girl

prefects must often co-operate. The life of the school does not flow in two separate streams, and many problems arise affecting boys and girls alike. That the kind of training which this sort of co-operation gives is more varied and therefore more valuable than is to be had in the separate school seems to us self-evident. Boys and girls view problems of conduct from diverse standpoints ; and the necessity for mutual adjustment leads to a better appreciation of each other's opinions, and generally to the cultivation on both sides of a more balanced judgment. The girl acquires something of the boy's robustness of outlook, and the boy takes lessons from the girl in the exercise of the peculiarly feminine virtue of tact.

But the prefectship is not the only institution affording scope of this kind. In more than one co-educational school there are representative boards, elected by boys and girls respectively, meeting sometimes together and sometimes apart. These " eights," as in one case they are called, while exercising no executive or legislative function, have yet full powers of deliberation ; nothing is alien to their inquiries which is in the least degree relevant to the business or welfare of the school. In the less official atmosphere of this assembly there is perhaps even more diversity of view, and certainly less either of tact or of compromise in the expression of it. The longest and loudest tongue sometimes, no doubt, proves the most persuasive. But the faults are the faults of youth —and of democracy—and the experience serves, we trust, as a useful anti-toxin against the greater

virulence of the real disease as found in adult democratic assemblies.

Further, the co-educational school, like any other, has its literary and debating societies, its natural history clubs, its photomaniacs and budding newspaper editors. It has, too, its social functions—occasional dances and annual picnics. In these activities and entertainments the sexes share equally and gain much from their co-operation. Whether they are managing a bazaar, or holding a concert, or debating the iniquities of the Government, or celebrating the king's birthday, or merely taking tea by fifties in the woods, boys and girls have to learn to practise mutual courtesy towards each other, and to think before they act; for conduct, which towards one's own sex may simply be included in the rules of the game, is often rudeness to the other sex.

Of dancing we would speak more in particular. As we do not agree with Bunyan or (strange conjunction!) Byron that dancing is a device of the Devil, we think it a distinct advantage of the co-educational method that it provides natural opportunities for the dancing of the sexes together. Now we are not out for rhapsodical analogies. We will not, for example, venture to assert that the rhythmical convolutions of bodies pursuing in conjunction a rotatory motion in space of necessity induces in those concerned a corresponding harmony of souls—we will leave that to the new American religions. But this at least we will say: no one who has witnessed even the

informal dance of a Saturday evening in a co-educational school will deny that, as a test of the attitude of the sexes towards each other, the easy courtesy, the absence of foolish shyness, the perfect naturalness, which mark conduct on these occasions, are as satisfactory whether in themselves or for their symbolic value as the most captious critic could desire.

To turn to more serious activities—if there be, as there always ought to be, a school mission to the East End, or some similar quarter, to bring boys and girls into touch with those less fortunately situated than themselves—here again they have all to gain and nothing to lose from sharing their work and interest. In their attitude to poverty and its attendant miseries, girls are apt to show more sympathy for the individual case, while boys interest themselves more readily in the social and economic aspects of the problem. Nothing is more needed among social reformers than a union of those two points of view. If the workers of the Charity Organisation Society and the supporters of the Minority Report, instead of shaking their fists at each other, would shake each other's hands, the work of both of them would be more efficacious.

There is another reason why boys and girls should be interested together in the work of social reform. If the entry of women into political life is soon to be an accomplished fact, it is important that the possibilities of sex conflict, already inherent in our economic and social conditions, should not be increased

by lack of co-operation between the men and women who are seeking to disentangle the Gordian knot. We believe fervently in the value of teaching boys and girls the duty of social service, based on a knowledge of actual conditions ; and that, both for their own sakes and still more because in this course lies the best hope of rousing society from its lethargy in regard to the destitution in its midst, and the moral evils of which that destitution is in part the effect and in part the cause. And we are convinced that to teach boys and girls together is the best way both to inspire enthusiasm and to ensure future harmony.

We have scarcely referred as yet to the presence of women on the staff. The prejudice against women teachers for boys is by no means new. Sir Thomas Elyot, in spite of the aptness of the sentiments we quoted from him at the beginning of this chapter, offers an early example of this particular bogey. He writes: "After that a childe is come to seuen years of age, I hold it expedient that he be taken from the company of women : sauynge that he may have one yere, or two at the most, an auncient and sad matrone, attendynge on hym in his chambre, which shall nat have any yonge woman in her company . . . the most sure counsaile is, to withdraw him from all company of women, and to assigne unto him a tutor, which sholde be an auncient and worshipfull man." [1] Few people nowadays would err quite so far as that on the side of caution. But for seven, write fourteen,

[1] " The Governour," I. vi.

and the principle will still find many supporters. Miss Mabel Hawtrey, writing on Co-education about the time of the introduction of the co-educational movement into England, echoed Dean Burgon on a similar theme, and established by her prophecies her reputation as an educational Cassandra. She voiced the view that by the age of fourteen boys have imbibed sufficient feminine influence to mould aright their ideas on sex questions ; she opines that when they enter the Public School " they will find nothing in the life there that will make them take a disparaging view of their female relatives." [1] Leaving aside the question of other people's female relatives, we think the criticisms which we quoted from eminent headmasters in the first chapter amount to an adequate refutation of this theory. The boy aged fourteen to eighteen needs the influence of women quite as much as his younger brother does, and quite as much as he needs the influence of girls. Critics of Co-education are fond of reminding us that at this period boys stand in particular need of strong masculine control. We heartily agree—but are quite at a loss to understand why this necessity should be held incompatible with the presence of women. The fact is that a mixed staff is no hindrance whatever to the maintenance of a strict discipline over boys, so long as the proportion between masters and mistresses is fairly evenly kept ; and we are not at all sure that under English conditions a numerical preponderance of women would involve any relaxation. At any rate

[1] " The Co-education of the Sexes," p. 20 (published 1896).

we have never found any difficulty in practice; and practice is a much surer test than theory. Certainly discipline proves easier of attainment in the co-educational than in the separate school—a result which is frequently noted with surprise by outside observers.[1] But this is far from meaning that the discipline demanded is of a lower standard. The greater sensitiveness of girls to the moral as opposed to the physical appeal has, by its influence on boys, some part in this result. But the relation of boys to mistresses has something to do with it as well. The common but vicious tradition that the schoolmaster is " fair game " to the boy does not apply in the case of the schoolmistress. The question of manners enters into the relation. Infringement of discipline is liable to be interpreted as lack of courtesy. The boy has to

[1] It may surprise some that we have not here entered upon a discussion as to the different kinds of discipline needed by boy and girl respectively. The truth is, there is no special problem created by Co-education. For minor offences not much, if any, distinction is demanded. Grave infringements of discipline, such as are visited in the case of the boy with corporal punishment, are dealt with, when a girl is the culprit, in other ways—very much, we imagine, as in girls' schools. The suggestion that the suspicion of greater leniency towards girls will arouse jealousy or anger in boys has no foundation in fact. Moreover, punishment which is less severe, considered objectively, is often in reality heavier, owing to the girl's greater sensibility.

In view of Professor Welton's opposition to Co-education we think the following quotation of some slight interest:—" What we have said about boys (*i.e.* with regard to discipline) may require some modification when applied to girls. But the modification is only of detail: the general principles are unaffected by the difference of sex."—Welton and Blandford, " Moral Training through School Discipline " (Preface).

adapt himself accordingly ; and his attitude to discipline in general undergoes a change. He becomes more amenable to the moral appeal, and less susceptible to the otherwise common fallacy that those who teach him are his natural enemies.

Again, the constant presence of women, whom he is bound to respect, for their position if for no other reason, is a further help to that sex reverence which is so important for him. Moreover, that faculty of sympathy which, it is generally conceded, makes women more successful than men as teachers of the very young, is not wasted upon older children. Women may and do find ways to inspire boys who remain quite impervious to the efforts of teachers of their own sex. Finally, their presence lends an air of domesticity to the life of an institution which is yet consistent with a virile atmosphere and an unflinching discipline. They give to the life of the school as much as it is possible and desirable to impart of the life of the home.

It remains to add a few words to what we have said about the girl, as affected by the atmosphere of a co-educational school. But let us first of all seek to dispel a misconception which is, we think, the root of much honest opposition to Co-education on behalf of the girl. It is urged that the conditions of a co-educational school must deprive the girl of the privilege of privacy ; we are told there are times when it is good for the girl to seek seclusion even to some extent from those of her own sex, and still more so from men and boys ; that, apart from this

occasional need, the girl requires in her leisure moments a more peaceful atmosphere than is necessary or congenial to the boy ; that she wants periods of complete rest ; that her indoor hobbies are of a less noisy character, and will be interfered with by the presence of boys—that the noise of the fret-saw is not conducive to the peaceful progress of the needle, nor the whir of a model engine to improvement in pianoforte. All these needs we admit ; as also the corollary that they involve some measure of segregation. We will even go further and admit that a measure of segregation is a good thing in itself—in order that girls may more easily cultivate intimate friendships with each other, and indulge in that confidential converse which is so much commoner among them than among boys. A boy likes to talk to a dozen people at once; a girl is more comfortable *tête à tête*. It is important that girls should have their own quarters to which they can retire when they feel so inclined—to which, indeed, they should be encouraged to retire.

But this admission is not in the least incompatible with Co-education. In the day there are twenty-four hours ; of days there are seven to each week ; and of weeks, twelve or thirteen to every term. It would be strange indeed if it were not possible so to adjust matters that boys and girls should have both full chance for mutual acquaintance and influence, and also space for such privacy as they respectively require. For we do not overlook the fact that the boy as well as the girl wants sometimes to be alone with his fellows. No boy can save his soul who is denied the

occasional privilege of making unlimited noise. Nor would we deprive him of that other privilege, of sometimes bruising his friends. But natural courtesy forbids the shedding of blood in the presence of the gentler sex. Let us therefore draw veils, or build partitions, as circumstances demand. We would not wish to restrict any legitimate activity of either sex. Our educational ideals are nothing if they are not catholic.

But to resume—we have seen that the girl too shares—and that vitally—in the fairer opportunities for a pure and healthy outlook. It is amazing that one should still meet with the fear that Co-education will make the girl more sentimental. From the *a priori* point of view alone, the co-educational school has obvious advantages over the girls' high school in this regard. It is an unfortunate fact that the deeper sensibility of womanhood, from which flows so much of feminine charm and power, is apt to lead the sex on occasion into excesses of emotionalism; and that the danger of such excesses is considerably increased, where and when women or girls are crowded together without admixture of the other sex. No one denies that there is a great risk of unhealthy emotionalism in girls' schools.

Too much has perhaps been made by critics of the high schools of the exaggerated heroine-worship which does certainly occur. The deep attachments which are formed between mistresses and girls at school are very often of great and lasting value; and if the mistress be wise no harm is done by the admiration very properly felt for her by her pupils. On the

contrary, such admiration is of course a powerful instrument for good. Nevertheless there is real danger of an unhealthy emotionalism taking the place of simple affection with results detrimental alike to the girls' moral and mental strength. Now the fact is that in our own experience of girls at a co-educational school this kind of thing has never occurred. And we can scarcely imagine it occurring in the atmosphere of such a school. The girl educated with boys avoids the extreme of emotionalism by having her emotions trained to a natural exercise.

A further moral gain comes to her from the greater simplicity of the boy's code with its downright assertion that this or that must not be done. Even if —as is the fact—the girls themselves contribute no small share to the moral and ethical code of a co-educational school, they gain from the boys a more unquestioning recognition that the code is there and must not be violated. The result is greater straightforwardness, less tendency to seek a way round, more courage in (what they have learnt from the boys to call) " playing the game." Nor is it a small thing that they learn to attach less importance to the emotion of the moment, and to find a firmer basis (even if it be not free from error) for their likes and dislikes, their judgments and resolves. Mentally they gain in two important directions—independence and concentration. In the latter quality boys still have the advantage, even over girls who have been brought up co-educationally. A boy who is really set upon it can at all ages accomplish a mental task more

rapidly than a girl who is in other respects his equal. But the influence of the boys tends very much to lessen the gap. The power of independent work is one which more than any other has suffered from the unscientific methods of education hitherto prevailing; and we may hope to see, resulting from the scientific system of the future, an advance in this direction almost beyond our present power of conception. But, little developed as is the faculty at present in either sex, a co-educational school makes it abundantly clear that the girls start here at a disadvantage, but are not slow to profit by the example of the abler boys, until the best only remain their superiors in the power of working alone.

Of independence in the wider sense—real independence of standpoint—much the same may be said. In all ranks of society the truly independent—man or woman—are very few. Many men lay wrongful claim to it, supporting their claim by a pose of noisy rudeness or empty cynicism, and a few women are now following this example. If it is to foster the true type, a school must have other virtues besides Co-education, but, if such a school there be, it is difficult to overestimate the power it should possess of giving women that feminine independence of view which would help them far more than any agitation over "rights" to their true position beside men in the work and thought of the world. It is generally conceded to be a weak point of the greater women teachers, that they have aimed overmuch, be it consciously or unconsciously, at stamping their own mark

upon their girls. In a co-educational school with a staff equally representing both sexes this ceases to be a temptation either for masters or for mistresses. For there are too many sides to the life of the school and too diverse interests to afford such a possibility. In the better days for education, which are coming, it may safely be predicted that the schools in which boys and girls, masters and mistresses have full scope to act and react, one upon the other, will be the homes of true independence.

Reference has been already made to the raising of the boys' standard of manners and courtesy, due to the presence of girls. That is obviously inevitable. What is *a priori* less to be expected, yet undoubtedly the case, is the help, rendered by the presence of boys, to the refinement, manners and true womanliness of the girls. It was not unnatural that, when the memorable movement for women's education, with which so many great names are associated, established schools capable of comparison with the Public Schools for boys, there should be a tendency to go rather further in imitation of these latter than was really either necessary or desirable. Private schools have followed the example thus set ; and it can hardly be questioned that in a good many matters both of *curriculum* and school tradition it would be well to consider more carefully the need of differentiation (a need, by the way, which co-educationalists are ignorantly supposed to neglect). One of the results of this more or less conscious striving after the methods of boys' schools has been a tendency to lay

little stress upon the refinement and delicacy of manners, which have not ceased to be desirable in girls with the death of the academies, which caricatured them. The girls themselves have entered readily enough into the idea of being, saying and doing as their brothers; and the result has been the production of a rather "masculine" type, observable enough to be the subject of not a few of Mr Punch's pictures. In a co-educational school everything tends to remind the girl constantly that differences do exist and should be maintained. Brothers and sisters in a country house may forget sometimes the etiquette of sex, but when schoolfellows come on a visit the necessary differences have to be recollected. And this is the position which holds at a school for boys and girls. Both realise that the game cannot be played without rules and that, if one side is to have the benefit of these, it must play the game with scrupulous fairness on its own part. If the girls are to be given the treatment to which their sex entitles them, they must remember to act as girls rather than tomboys. And in fact at those co-educational schools at which the differences of sex are not ignored (and we uphold no other) the most casual visitors do notice a tradition of refinement in language and manners, which is scarcely typical of the modern segregated schoolgirl.

It would be easy to multiply instances of advantage received by one sex from the other through all the years from five to twenty, which should be the range of ages in a co-educational school. Not

the least is indeed this possibility of including all ages in one community (impracticable for obvious reasons in schools for boys only), which does more than anything else towards reproducing in the school Nature's own plan of the family with all its pure and generous associations. Are there any corresponding disadvantages ? The Master of a famous Cambridge college asked this question almost pleadingly at a meeting to discuss Co-education, for which he had kindly provided room. Evidently he felt that one or two admitted drawbacks would dispose the audience to a readier belief in the advantages claimed. But alas! the lecturer could produce out of his long experience not so much as a little one. Nor are we in better case. For the fact is that the unnatural has at no point —nor can have—any advantage over the natural. There is no advantage in lacking a father or a mother. There is no gain in being without brothers or without sisters. And similarly experience will show at no point any advantage held by the monastic system over that in which the kindly provisions of natural wisdom are used gratefully and to the utmost. Yet stay. In *The Daily Graphic* correspondence, already mentioned, the Dean of Manchester did make an unanswerable point against us, when he affirmed that he had yet to learn that England's co-educational schools could produce so glorious a roll of famous *alumni* as the Public Schools for boys only. No reply was attempted save that the twentieth century was at present at a like disadvantage as compared with the nineteenth.

CHAPTER X

MENTAL DIFFERENCES AND THEIR BEARING

". . . 'You suppose their capacities are equal?' 'Things are not equal. I suppose their excellences to make a pretty nearly equal sum in the end, but we are not weighing them each. The question concerns the advantage of both.' 'That seems just,' said Aminta."—"Lord Ormont and his Aminta."

THOSE who opened this book in the expectation of reading a technical treatise on educational method must long ere this have felt a grievance against us. There are many to whom Co-education signifies simply a problem of the *curriculum* and nothing more; and on that basis alone they are content to settle it out of hand one way or the other. And, however much one may stress the moral and social aspects of the question, it still of course remains true that the requirements of education in the stricter sense of cultural and vocational training must be satisfied, if our proposals are to win acceptance. That the factor of sex has an important bearing in this part of the subject we have no wish to deny. But if we do not delve so deeply as some would have us do into the *minutiæ* of sex psychology, we refrain for quite good reasons. In the first place, there is as yet no established body of doctrine to which we can appeal on the

subject of the mental differences of sex. In the second place, and more importantly, our experience of the practical working of Co-education has not suggested any crying need for such assistance. If the sickrooms of a co-educational school were continually full of girls prostrate from the stress of competition, or boys grown weak and sluggish from the lack thereof, one might admit the need for a more profound study of the underlying causes. But if, as is the case, the system gives rise to no difficulties which are beyond the scope of ordinary common-sense, one is impelled to neglect the theory and let the theorists talk.

The objections to Co-education from the standpoint of the " educationalist " group themselves under two heads. The first, which opens up a discussion of quite other range than that of education *per se*, is that boys and girls are destined to different careers and accordingly require different subjects of study and different methods of training.[1] The second is that the sexes are divided by mental as well as by physical differences, of such a character that to make them work together can only result in injury to both.

The majority of girls, we are told, are destined to be wives and mothers, and this destiny must therefore be kept in view as the main object of their education. We suggested in a previous chapter that this ideal in the hands of its supporters is apt to be carried to an

[1] We are aware that " vocational " differences do not really come under the category of " mental " ; but the discussion of the subject is included here, as its importance does not seem to merit a separate chapter.

extreme which disregards actual conditions. It is generally accompanied by a mistrust or misunderstanding of the changes in the position of women, and harks back to an ideal of home life too narrow for modern needs and opportunities. On this point we are glad to have some authoritative support. Miss Frances Melville, head of Queen Margaret College, Glasgow, writes: "But apart from the fact that the domestic ideal applied too exclusively in the education of girls defeats the purpose of its best advocates —viz. that of turning out truly domestic women in the highest sense—and, at a much lower level, is not even thorough-going enough, it shows itself inappreciative of present-day conditions." [1] She deprecates the idea that the stress of intellectual work is injurious to the physical development of girls. "It seems more probable that there cannot be true health of body unless the mind is putting out its powers to a considerable and varied extent in good, hard, and often abstract thinking, and in applying reason to practice." [2] In a contribution to the same volume Professor J. A. Thomson considers the question of girls' education from the biological standpoint. He objects strongly to the tendency to divorce intellectuality from motherhood. "To admit that artificial and readily alterable conditions may tell against what the Germans call 'full motherhood,' and strong children, is a very different matter from admitting that higher education is, biologically considered, bad

[1] "The Position of Women," p. 123.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

for the race." He would "have the sexes taught together *and* taught separately, taught by men *and* women." [1] In other words, he would approve a co-educational school with an elastic *curriculum*. Other contributors testify to the value of some measure of Co-education to women beyond the domestic circle. Miss Phœbe Sheavyn, Warden of Ashburne Hall, Manchester University, writes that the lack of intercourse with the other sex is a handicap to women in professional life.[2] Dr Clouston has "often been much struck with the combined intellectual, administrative and domestic capacity that generally prevails in the women of the Society of Friends," [3] with whom a considerable amount of intercourse between boys and girls at all ages has always been the rule.

But, granted that intellectual development is essential, not detrimental, to growing girls, it might still be that with them intellectual development should not follow the same lines as with boys ; that, in short, they should study different, if not less difficult, subjects in accordance with the necessities of their probable future career. There are many who hold that the distinction which must evidently be made is fatal to the possibility of Co-education. Thus Mr and Mrs Whetham, while approving thoroughly of the general advantages of Co-education from other points of view, yet write : "It is when we come to the problems of training for the purpose of gaining a

[1] "The Position of Women," p. 25.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 99.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 110.

livelihood—which has become the predominant feature of our English educational system—that the separation of the sexes seems essential." [1] And they go on to emphasise the importance of the domestic side of feminine education. Miss Mabel Hawtrey, in one of the only three English books which, so far as we know, have been written on Co-education, makes clear the root of this fear. For she accepts as a definition of Co-education the obsolete description of Dr Clarke: "Boys and girls are taught the same things at the same time, in the same place, by the same faculty, with the same methods and under the same regimen." [2] But there is not the slightest reason why Co-education should mean identical education.

When we come to consider the actual subjects of the *curriculum* and their suitability for either sex, we find there is no unanimity among those who oppose Co-education. Writing in *Truth*, an "Old Educational Hand" suggests that "it may well be asked whether the study of languages, either ancient or modern, offers many advantages to the generality of girls, and whether a good knowledge of the history of their own country and the Empire, of mathematics and logic, would not prepare many of them more effectually for the battle of life." [3] Leaving aside the evident implication (to which we altogether demur) that the best logical training is to be had from the study of logic (rather than, as we should have thought,

[1] "Heredity and Society," p. 113.
[2] "The Co-education of the Sexes," p. 13.
[3] *Truth*, 29th May 1912.

from the study of language), these suggestions offer other curious points for discussion. We have not yet come across the school where history can be studied only as an alternative to languages. Nor do we see why girls, who are admittedly (as the writer agrees) good at languages, should substitute for them mathematics, in which subject it is generally found that they are slightly inferior to boys. If girls need to *concentrate* more on mathematics, what better plan can you have than Co-education ? The stimulus of competition with boys will effect precisely what is required.

But the dispute does not generally refer to what one may call the staple subjects of the *curriculum*. With regard to these, there is little difference between the time-tables of boys' and girls' schools. Miss Bryant, headmistress of the North London Collegiate School for Girls, speaking at the Conference of the Association of Headmistresses in 1905, objected to Co-education on certain grounds, but said at the same time: "I hold strong views that the *curriculum* for boys and girls should not greatly differ, except on the technical side." Her objections to Co-education were on the score of mental difference, a point with which we shall deal shortly.

The complaint made against Co-education on the ground of vocational training is really the complaint which has been made for some time against girls' education generally. The movement for the higher education of girls had to justify itself in face of opposition, and did so by proving that girls could

compete with boys in the subjects which boys mainly studied. Under the circumstances it was not surprising that strictly domestic subjects should be somewhat cast into the shade. And now it is supposed that Co-education will thrust them still further into the background by enforcing a strictly masculine time-table—that the girls in a co-educational school must of necessity be sacrificed to the boys. With regard to this possibility we invite consideration to the following points. In the first place it is quite possible, without disturbing the time-table as a whole, to arrange for a certain differentiation of work by which girls are studying purely domestic subjects, while boys are engaged upon engineering, practical carpentry, or similar masculine occupations. And the differentiation may proceed to even greater lengths. It may prove desirable, for example, that girls should follow a more literary, and boys a more scientific or mathematical course; in which case adjustments are possible by which extra science and extra literature lessons coincide. In any case, even if the revolution in educational principle, foreshadowed in our introductory chapter, take long to accomplish in its fulness, the signs of the times all point to a great extension of individual work in the future, and a more elastic *curriculum*, with a system of "electives," which will relegate the sex distinction to a position of minor importance, as is in fact already the case in America. It seems probable, however, that, with the widening of our ideas as to the meaning of education, and the growth of a belief in the superiority of the

cultural over the utilitarian element, the *curricula* of boys and girls will become more liberal and less differentiated. For one thing, we may expect the incubus of examinations to be lessened. There are signs in many quarters of a growing impatience with its demands, and there is some indication that Co-education is acting as a lever in the right direction. In *The Pedagogical Seminary* for March 1910 Professor Leo Burgerstein writes approvingly of the success of Co-education in Finland, and discusses the possibility of its extension in Central Europe. The main difficulty, in his view, is the folly of imposing upon girls a stereotyped examination-ridden system (governed by the supposed necessities of the public service) which is already proving highly injurious to boys. And he looks forward to a lightening of the pressure in the interests of boys and girls alike. We may hope that something of the kind will happen in England.

At first sight the objections to Co-education on the score of mental differences (including physical differences, in so far as they affect mental capacity) seem more serious. Boys and girls develop physically at different rates, and it cannot be denied that this fact has some influence on their mental development. Adolescence tends to begin earlier for the girl than for the boy ; and the earlier physical maturity seems to be accompanied for a time by more rapid intellectual growth. The girl of fifteen has no difficulty in competing with boys of about her own age. But whereas the intellectual development of the boy between fifteen and eighteen is accompanied by increasing

capacity to stand the strain of hard intellectual work, it is generally agreed that girls, whether or no their mental capacity be the same, cannot be taxed physically to the same extent. It should be noted, however, that the period of greatest stress in the physical development of the girl—viz. between fourteen and sixteen—is not the period when she is most keenly competing with others, be they boys or girls (for experience shows that there is at no time any consciousness of sex rivalry). That does not come till two or three years later. But the simple truth is that the admission of the difference does not in the least upset the case for Co-education. It is all a question of degree ; and experiment has amply proved that the difference, though it exists, is not sufficient to make serious difficulties in the working together of boys and girls. The argument that competition with boys is physically injurious to girls is really a resuscitation of the old objection to higher education for girls under any form. The condition of many girls' schools a generation ago certainly warranted the protest ; but on quite accidental grounds. Miss Carey Thomas, President of Bryn Mawr, has said : " It is clear that the physiologists have confused cause and effect ; they have attributed to brain-work what was the result of poor nutrition and unhygienic conditions." [1] The experience of America has refuted the prophecies of Dr Clarke ; and the evidence of women teachers in other countries tells in the same direction. Thus Mme. Palmgren, of the great Swedish

[1] Quoted by S. Poirson in " La Co-éducation," p. 200.

co-educational school, writes : " Quant à la discussion physiologique . . . aux Etats-Unis les assertions du Dr Clarke ne sont plus en faveur. En Suède, elles sont tout à fait fausses." [1] And Mademoiselle Hagmann, head of a co-educational school at Helsingfors, asserts that 98 per cent. of the girls, who took their diplomas there, were on their own showing never in such good health as during their school course.[2] Our own experience in a school where many boys and girls have worked up to the standard of university scholarships entirely corroborates this evidence. We cannot furnish exact statistics, but we can confidently affirm that the overstrain of girls has never proved with us anything like so serious a danger as it appears to be in many girls' schools ; we do not, as a matter of fact, recall a single case which could be said to be due to competition with boys.

We may note here another objection to Co-education, connected with that under discussion. It is urged that for some time to come the headship of the co-educational school will remain a masculine monopoly ; and it is suggested that this arrangement will involve a sacrifice of the interests of girls and especially a disregard for their physical welfare. This is the objection most constantly put forward by head-mistresses of girls' schools, and other women teachers.[3] It seems to us to lose somewhat of its force by being

[1] Quoted by S. Poirson in " La Co-éducation," p. 205.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 40.
[3] *E.g.* the pamphlet issued in opposition to Co-education by the Association of Headmistresses in 1905.

so often urged on purely "Trade Union" grounds —from the point of view, that is to say, of the mistress rather than of the girl. We must admit that, under English conditions, the opportunities to women to become heads of co-educational schools are not likely to be plentiful. The vital point is that the question should be settled in the interests, not of the teaching profession, but of the pupils. However important the interests of women teachers may be, they must adjust themselves to this prior claim. On the question of the headship we do not wish to dogmatise one way or the other. But we must regard it as certainly established that the retention of the headship by a man is not incompatible with the safeguarding of the interests of girls. Nor do we think that the position which women occupy under such an arrangement, as regards scope for the exercise of directive power, compares at all unfavourably with the position of a headmistress in supreme control. Mrs Bevan Lean, wife of the headmaster of Sidcot school, has well described the position of a woman head, who is yet technically subordinate to a man: "The Senior Mistress is consulted in the appointment of Assistant Mistresses, and she has authority to grant leave of absence for a Sunday to mistresses. She apportions duty among the Assistant Mistresses, and interests herself in its efficient discharge. During the absence of the Head she acts in consultation with the Senior Master in making and carrying out arrangements. She especially considers the educational interests of the girls, and the work and interests of the women

teachers, when consulted by the Head on the *curriculum*. She has general supervision of the arrangements made for the proper use of the leisure-time of the girls. Ordinary cases of breach of school discipline by girls will be reported to the Senior Mistress by masters and others ; in cases of persistent disorder or offences which are moral in character, she consults with the Head himself or through me. While the health of the boys and girls is looked after by a trained resident nurse and myself, yet the Senior Mistress is able to help greatly and is able sometimes to point out signs of overstrain or need for extra care among the girls." [1] A Board of Education Inspector who inspected this school wrote that "it is scarcely possible to suggest any improvement in the plans made for supervising the girls' health." We need not go on to discuss the further objection that girls will lose in point of spiritual and moral, as well of bodily health. The above quotation must make it clear that the girl in the co-educational school has no less opportunity than she would have elsewhere for seeking and obtaining the sympathetic guidance of those of her own sex.

Apart from the fact that the physical handicap of girls is often exaggerated, there are other considerations which lessen the danger. Overstrain is not simply a question of the amount of work ; it is in a greater degree the result of the attitude of the worker. One reason why the average boy does not suffer from overstrain is that he rarely allows himself

[1] From a paper read to the Bristol branch of the P.N.E.U. in 1909.

to be completely absorbed by his work; he has a wide range of external interests, and his breezy attitude to life in general successfully secures him from morbid concentration on the acquisition of knowledge. But the girl is different. Her greater sensibility and—we must add—her greater conscientiousness render her more liable to worry about her work. She broods over her tasks, and reproaches herself for her imperfections; and she wastes a good deal of nervous energy in this direction, which the boy saves just because of his traditionally "boyish" ways. In a purely feminine environment there is little to check this tendency, although the development of physical training for girls and the introduction of a more virile tone and method into girls' schools are undoubtedly having a good effect. In the co-educational school the less worrying nature of the boy acts as a tonic to brace the girl; and although the attitude of the sexes respectively to approaching examinations still brings out the difference, it is scarcely discernible in the ordinary routine of school work, except that the girl exhibits greater application. Her example is not without its influence on the boy, but in so far as he still falls below her standard, she has an advantage over him in competition. The interaction of the two natures maintains a wholesome balance which far outweighs any difficulties which may be supposed to arise from unequal capacities.

But that the capacities of boy and girl are rightly described as unequal is an assumption to which we are not prepared to assent. The phrase itself has little

meaning when considered in relation to the facts of the case. Boys and girls, it is true, learn in somewhat different ways, have their mental powers developed in different proportions, are attracted by different subjects, or different aspects of the same subject. This may or may not be termed inequality. The only question, however, which merits consideration, is whether the mental differences of boys and girls are such that their working together involves mutual loss or gain. And that is a matter to be decided by experiment.[1]

It would be a tedious task to collect and collate all that has been urged against Co-education on the ground of mental incompatibility between the sexes.

[1] The science of experimental psychology is still nascent; its results therefore must be received with caution. It is interesting, however, to note that so far as sex differences have been tested by the new method, the result is to minimise rather than to magnify them. We quote from a paper by Mr Cyril Burt, "Experimental Tests of Higher Mental Processes and their Relation to General Intelligence" (reprint from *Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and Training College Record*):

"Other sex differences may be negligible; but in cutaneous discrimination, the validity of the striking sex difference, shown by the children tested, seems established beyond dispute. Now this test is the only test of all, which, in my experience, yields no appreciable correlation with intelligence. . . . The tests that yield correlations with intelligence, more intimate than the test of touch but less intimate than the reasoning tests, uniformly disclose sex differences smaller than the former test, but larger than the latter. . . . So far as the experiments take us, the biggest difference (æsthesiometer) is found on the lowest levels; small but distinct differences are found upon slightly higher levels (alphabet, memory, sums); no significant differences are found on the highest level of all (reasoning)."

A more satisfactory course is to examine some one authoritative expression of the opposition under this head, letting that stand sponsor for the rest. Such a summary in concise form is contained in Professor Welton's "Psychology of Education."[1] Under the general head of "Variations in mental endowment" he gives an account of the psychical differences which distinguish the sexes, similar to that we have touched upon in a previous chapter. "Speaking generally," he says, "woman's outlook on the world is more determined by feeling than is that of man. . . . It follows that she regards things and events as wholes which have a value for feeling. She is more sensitive to their beauty and to their harmony with their surroundings than is man. On the other hand, she does not care for abstract thought. . . . Here is the root of the difference between the reasoning of man and of woman. Man analyses and applies principles deductively; woman takes the special case and its value for feeling." He recognises, and here we are, of course, in complete agreement with him, that the difference is one not of degree but of kind. In proceeding to consider the application of psychical differences of sex in the case of children, Professor Welton notes some of the more obvious divergencies in the modes of expressing the emotions and the will, and goes on to describe the distinction in intellectual endowment and its bearing on education. "Girls," he writes, "do well in all that demands neither originality of thought nor abstraction. Thus, they quite keep pace

[1] pp. 127-135.

with boys, or even surpass them, in the earlier school studies, which deal essentially with concrete wholes." He admits the superiority of the girl in point of memory, power of imitation, appreciation of beauty and faculty of imaginative composition. While approving Co-education in the earlier stages, he urges that " the further that earlier stage is passed, the more do the intellectual differences of the sexes become operative. Soon boys and girls begin to retard each other's progress—the girls being held back for the slower boys in some subjects, and in their turn hindering the advance of the boys in other subjects."

We should attach more value to the criticisms of Professor Welton, had he not vitiated the whole of his argument by a profound misstatement of our position. " Really," he concludes, " at the bottom of the advocacy of mixed schools lies the idea which, for the reasons I have given, I believe to be profoundly mistaken, that true evolution means the gradual elimination of the differences of sex." Nothing of the sort. In our abhorrence of this supposititious fallacy we yield not at all to the Professor. On the contrary, we thoroughly approve him where he writes that " it is not the identification of sex qualities to which evolution points the way, but to *their more perfect mutual adaptation*" (italics ours). What we still marvel at is the incompatibility of this *dictum* with Professor Welton's general conclusion. Qualities, we presume, are attributes of persons. Yet we are gravely told that, to secure the mutual adaptation of personal

qualities, we must by all means keep the persons apart. Truly a topsy-turvy world!

To return to the question of differences: "It is doubtful," we find it written, "whether sufficient attention has been paid to such considerations as these by the advocates and promoters of joint schools for the sexes." The truth is that, so far as the case for Co-education rests upon its intellectual advantages, it is just "such considerations as these" and their true bearing which make the backbone of the argument. We shall deal shortly with the relative abilities of the sexes in different subjects. But, admitting for the sake of argument that the differences are such as to make girls conspicuously inferior in some subjects, and boys in others, it does not yet follow that they cannot work together without mutual injury. Even if we leave out of account the probability that "class work" will play a much less part in the school of the future than it has done in the past—making a dead level of achievement a less necessary ideal—we still decline to admit that the sex distinction introduces any novel difficulty. Those who object to our proposals on this score seem altogether to forget that grading is, in any case, a necessity of class work. Why assume that a girl must necessarily be placed in the same "set" as all the boys of her own age? She may be in a higher set than her twin brother in one subject, a lower in another. The difficulty, like so many raised against Co-education, is wholly imaginary. As a matter of fact our experience of the general mental difference of sex is entirely in accord with the

conclusion of a writer who apparently approaches the question from the purely theoretical standpoint. "In any case it would not be unnatural to assume that the common foundation would be far larger than any difference arising from mere difference of sex: divergencies in detail might arise, scarcely difference in essentials." [1]

From the point of view of the boy the earlier awakening of the girl's intelligence, and the example and incentive thus supplied to him, are an unmixed gain. Professor Davis, of Minnesota, writes: "There can be little doubt that in the elementary classes the fact that inexact, sluggish-minded youths are obliged to see their dulness exhibited daily before keen, precise young women is a vast incentive to those youths to do their best." [2] That the boy will suffer from the undue competition of the girl at this stage is a suggestion sometimes made, but one with which we have little sympathy. Therefore we do not quite agree with Ruskin when he writes: "And indeed, if there were to be any difference between a girl's education and a boy's, I should say that of the two the girl should be earlier led, as her intellect ripens faster, into deep and serious subjects." [3] If the

[1] Matthews, "Principles of Education," p. 125.

[2] Quoted by H. E. Piggott in a letter in *Child Study*, April 1912.

[3] "Sesame and Lilies," § 75. We should like to add a quotation of some interest from the previous section. ". . . a girl's education should be nearly, in its course and material of study, the same as a boy's; but quite differently directed. A woman in any rank of life *ought to know whatever her husband is likely to know*, but to know it in a different way. . . . Speaking broadly, a man ought

influence of girls can drive boys to an earlier interest in such concerns, who is the loser? For we must remember that the girl too gains, even when she stoops to work with boys in a field where the honours are hers. Mr Piggott, in the letter quoted above, asks, "Is it not possible that the free and easy, untroubled attitude of the boys may have its steadying effect upon the tense concentration and feverish application so often shown by the girls?" As a matter of fact girls are, as a rule, less able to concentrate than boys, but Mr Piggott is quite right in thinking that each sex, where superior, does provide a useful object-lesson to the other, and that the balance of advantages is in this way fairly evenly restored.

But, whatever may be the case in the earlier stages of school life, the opinion still persists strongly in many quarters that the girl after the age of fifteen falls far behind the boy in general mental efficiency. We would therefore remind our readers that the experience of America is decidedly against this supposition. Professor Stanley Hall, with his animus against Co-education, would certainly employ that

to know any language or science he learns, thoroughly—while a woman ought to know the same language, or science, *only so far as may enable her to sympathise in her husband's pleasures, and in those of his best friends.*" (Italics ours.) It is interesting that one who holds so exalted a view of the domestic ideal as *entirely to forget the spinsters*, should yet hold that boys' and girls' education should be so nearly alike. As for knowing in a different way, and being differently directed, Nature herself looks after the former requisite, and the latter is not at all incompatible with Co-education.

argument were there anything in it. But he says definitely: "The high school and college girl especially is far more mature than her boy class-mate of the same age, understands him far better than he can her, and is distinctly his mental superior for a time." As the High School in America is entered at the age of fifteen or sixteen and left at eighteen, the boy has little time to make up his apparent deficiency! It would appear indeed that "for a time" must cover part of the college course.

The question, however, cannot really be settled without a reference to the several subjects of the *curriculum*, and some discussion in each case of the difference, if any, between the sexes. Statistics on this question have recently been compiled and published by Mr G. F. Burness, head of the Stratford Secondary School (co-educational) in London.[1] We cannot pretend ourselves to attach any great value to statistics, and we have never collected any. But we admit an idiosyncrasy in the matter, and are willing to accept the figures of Mr Burness, so far as they are of universal validity. In regard to mathematics, Mr Burness's conclusion is that boys are superior to girls both at the age of fourteen to fifteen and at the age of eighteen to nineteen; and he quotes with approval the opinion of an inspector that girls on the average are one year behind boys in this subject. While Mr Burness's statistics of examination results certainly bear out his conclusion, we do not find that there is any unanimity in the opinions which

[1] "La Coéducation dans les Ecoles Secondaires," 1912.

have been expressed on this point. Thus Mr Piggott reports of Hornsey County School, that "in intellectual work the traditional disadvantages of girls have not shown themselves. Science and mathematics taught by men have been as enthusiastically and successfully pursued by the girls as by the boys"; while Mr W. Gregson, Chairman of the Higher Education Sub-Committee of Southend, says of a school of boys and girls aged twelve to sixteen: "Educationally we find that the girls have no difficulty in maintaining their position with boys in the first and second years; in the third or fourth years some drop back in higher mathematics, but only some." [1]

These discrepancies suggest that our own experience brings us as near the truth as any other: we have generally found that there is a difference between boys and girls in this respect, which may be represented by an average age in the case of girls a few months higher than in the case of boys in the same class; but the difference between the top and the bottom of the class is normal and there is no inevitable gravitation of the girls in the class to the bottom half. Of course, if the class teaching is of a stereotyped form, and if the school is so organised as to prevent the requisite elasticity, it is conceivable that girls will suffer from over-pressure or boys from insufficient stimulus. But there is, as we have suggested, no reason whatever why the girls should not be slightly older than the boys with whom they work in mathematics; any more than there is a reason why

[1] At the Conference of the Association of Headmistresses, 1905.

they should not be slightly younger than the boys with whom they work, for example, in literature. It is quite possible to have a system of " sets" working alongside of the " form " system ; under which boys or girls (for the arrangement is needed more on account of individual differences than of the sex difference), who are slightly behind the average in one subject, will work with a lower set than the rest of their forms. But we need hardly pursue the point. The difference is nothing very startling ; it is often entirely upset by individual exceptions ; and it can be arranged for by adjustments, which are in any case advisable, in order to meet the far greater discrepancies which are found between individuals quite irrespective of sex.

Similar observations apply in the case of science, in regard to which subject Mr Burness finds a somewhat similar difference between the sexes. He reports that in physics, chemistry and mechanics, girls on the whole show less power than boys of grasping general principles and generally of exercising initiative. The problem here, however, is somewhat altered by the fact that girls show more aptitude than boys for botany and hygiene ; which suggests that, in so far as the *curriculum* is not governed by the demands of external examinations which do not allow for sex, there should be a segregation of the sexes for this subject. Whether or no this be desirable on other grounds,[1] we will offer no dogmatic opinion ;

[1] Even the Americans are discovering that one boy or girl cannot study every subject for which a good claim may be made

but merely say in this case, too, that the difference in capacity is certainly not (to judge from our own experience) enough in itself to warrant segregation ; and certainly not such as to be beyond the scope of the arrangements we discussed in reference to mathematics.

In modern languages Mr Burness does not—even by the statistical method—find any appreciable difference between the sexes. The experience of some leads them to assign a certain superiority to the girl in this field. In either case there is no problem worth discussion. Neither does he find any difficulty with Latin ; and so far as general aptitude is concerned we are inclined to agree with him. It must be remembered, however, that the advanced study of ancient languages makes considerable demands upon the intellect ; and we agree that from the point of view of her physical health the girl needs more careful watching than the boy. In scholarship work so much more depends on the learner than on the teacher that overstrain in individual cases may escape notice. At the same time we feel bound to say that, although boys and girls have in our experience worked together for classical scholarships, and that with success in both cases, no single instance of overstrain on the part of girls has ever come before us ; neither have boys ever suffered in their work from having to do it along with girls. Most observers credit girls with better

out. And if there be room for one science subject only, there is much to be said for botany in the case of girls. Co-education offers no opposition to such divergences as seem advisable.

memory than boys ; and memory necessarily plays a large part in the learning and use of a language ; it may be that her better memory compensates the girl for her less physical endurance.

Hitherto we have contented ourselves with a negative answer to the critics. We have endeavoured to show that Co-education need not mean any lowering of the intellectual standard for boys, nor any undue pressure on girls. But we must note that even in subjects, which do not, in our opinion, offer special scope for the mutual influence of the sexes, there is always the advantage that general discipline is easier in the co-educational than in the separate school—for boys at any rate. We think, too, that diversity of method and different lines of interest among the members of a class are a gain rather than a loss. We may remark further that half the members of the class at any given time (assuming an even division of the sexes) are enjoying the advantage of being instructed by a teacher of the opposite sex. While it is futile to discuss whether it is better to be taught altogether by one's own sex or altogether by the other, we think it quite beyond dispute that a mixture of the two alternatives is better than either alone.

Turning to history, literature and English subjects generally, we are convinced that, from the purely intellectual point of view alone, Co-education has in this sphere positive advantages over the other system. We entirely endorse what Professor Welton says about the general superiority of the girl as

regards interest in pure literature and power of æsthetic appreciation ; and we are no less enthusiastic than Mr Burness in our recognition of the advantage to be derived from the association of the sexes in the study of a subject in respect of which their standpoints are, generally speaking, so divergent. For the girl is not ashamed to appear appreciative ; emotion with her is not a weakness to be hidden, but part of the stuff of life. She is borne on the wings of imagination—sometimes indeed " darkly, fearfully afar ! " In English style her fault lies not in leanness or lack of vocabulary, but rather in exuberance and verbosity.[1] The boy, on the other hand, is fearful of exhibiting genuine feeling, lest he be thought sentimental. The delicate distinction is one he learns with difficulty of himself, but more easily from the example of the girl. The girl at the same time learns from the boy that feeling as a test of value is not infallible, and her appreciative faculty is strengthened by the addition of an intellectual element. In history the girl's interest centres rather upon personalities, dramatic situations —moral problems, perhaps—than upon the following of effect on cause, the conflict of principles, or the evolution of polities. In preparing history for class work or examinations the girl often shows a surprising mastery of detail, but an inadequate sense

[1] " Of the two extremes of faulty diction—highflown language on the one hand, and cheap journalistic phrases, provincialisms, or even vulgarisms on the other, girls were more prone to the former, boys to the latter."—" Secondary Education (Scotland) Report for 1911," p. 15.

of proportion, a lack of interest in general principles and an insufficient grasp of the connection of events. Her generalisations are not always based on sound induction. That intuitive apprehension of the universal in the particular, which is generally allowed to be a mental characteristic of the feminine sex, comes at times into conflict with the "scientific" methods of modern historical study. In all then that has regard to the "universal" aspect of history, the girl, we think, has much to learn from masculine co-operation—and masculine instruction. And the proper study of history is important for her not from the cultural standpoint alone. It is a vital element in the education of woman as citizen. Effective citizenship in the modern state is not really possible without some comprehension of "the great social forces which move onward in their might and majesty," [1] some grasp of the logic of events, some interest too in "that history which is being for ever determined as the moments pass"; and experience assures us that in regard to all these points—although we do not wish to magnify the difference—boys are more readily aroused to enthusiasm than girls. But in this subject too the boy has something to learn from the girl —that ability to feel "unhistorically" as Nietzsche

[1] "The great social forces which move onward in their might and majesty are marshalled on our side."—W. E. Gladstone. The story goes that this sonorous utterance lost something of its effect from an interruption from the back of the hall: "Yes, but wot abaht the working man?"—an apt illustration of the importance to the *masculine* politician, when he is dealing with the *universal*, of not forgetting the *particular*.

says,[1] is essential to the right understanding and valuation of all historical events.

In no subject of the *curriculum* is that approximation of the pleasing and the useful, which is so helpful, easier than in music. And—what is more important—in no subject are school work and school life more nearly identified. This is not the place for a discourse on the educational value of music. But it is a reproach still to be levelled against English education as a whole, that the art to which Hebrew, Greek and Roman alike assigned a predominant place in the *moral* training of the young—which in older England too was held to be an essential part of the education of a gentleman—is treated as a subsidiary subject, both from the moral and the cultural point of view. But there is evidence of a growing recognition of the error. At any rate we, on our part, are altogether of Milton's opinion, where he writes that children " may both with profit and delight be taken up in recreating and composing their travailed spirits with the solemn and divine harmonies of music heard or learned . . . which, if wise men and prophets be not extreamly out, have a great power over dispositions and manners, to smooth and make them gentle from rustic harshness and distemper'd passions." [2] That the divine harmonies will exercise their power with a greater diversity of operation and a more pleasing variety of effect in choir and orchestra where boys and girls sing and play in unison than in the most tuneful

[1] " The Use and Abuse of History."
[2] " Tractate on Education."

monastic atmosphere imaginable, is to us a self-evident truth which we shall spend no further pains in establishing. We have already alluded to the general influence of girls in the services of the school chapel, and would only add here that the singing of boys and girls together in the chapel, while it adds to the beauty of the service, acts also as a powerful aid in the attainment of the spirit of true worship.

All that may be said of music in this connection is applicable to art in general. While it may be the case, as the misogynists are fond of reminding us, that the greatest genius in every branch of art has, almost without exception, been masculine, it yet remains true that the average woman displays greater æsthetic sensibility and appreciation than the average man. A corresponding difference, we think, is to be found between boy and girl ; with the result that in the co-educational school the boy is at a considerable advantage in regard to his artistic education as compared with his brother at the Public School. The refining influence, moreover, is not bounded by the limits of the time-table. We have already referred in a previous chapter to the importance attached by Thring to beauty as well as comfort of environment in school life. In this we follow Thring. Whilst we would warn our readers against the false impression that the co-educational school is upholstered in chintz and redolent of lavender bags, yet we cannot admit that even the furniture or the flower-pots altogether escape the subtle influence of Co-education. The feminine hand, duly restrained from excess by

masculine sternness, touches everything and leaves its mark "in grace of outward seeming and beauty of simple adornment."

The mistake which is made by Professor Welton, and those who oppose us on similar grounds, is in thinking that to establish intellectual differences is to upset the whole case for Co-education. The fallacy is extended to cover differences which are on the border-line between the intellectual and the moral. Thus Professor Welton asserts that the girl's greater imaginative power affects her conception of truth. "Boys lie, but as a rule they lie clumsily; girls lie artistically. And much experience and observation seem to show that girls lie more frequently than boys, and from more personal impulses. A girl appears seldom to lie to save another, a boy often does." That is a somewhat bald statement of an opinion which is widely accepted. But it affords no justification for allowing the girl (if we may be equally bald) to continue wallowing in her original sin. And no one with experience of boys and girls together will deny that, when the masculine and feminine conceptions of truth collide with each other, it is the simpler conception which tends to prevail. Similar remarks apply to the different ways in which the sexes regard competition. "Emulation among girls," writes Professor Welton, "is more likely to be coloured with envy and to lead to dishonourable forms of competition and more apt to grow into a long-continuing hatred, than with boys." Of competition we have already said that it does not in the least tend to follow the line of

sex distinction. As a primary motive of work, we are in any case averse to its encouragement; and we have always noted with satisfaction that the influence of boys has a beneficent effect on the attitude of girls in the matter.

We could have wished that Professor Welton had expounded at greater length his philosophy of sex differences considered as a factor in education. We find it, for example, a little curious that, while he assigns a greater interest in the abstract to the masculine, and in the concrete to the feminine mind —and gives this as a reason for sex segregation—at the same time, in explaining the psychology of the learning process, he indicates a union of these two elements as the essential basis of true knowledge. "In each case the whole of knowledge—which is both abstract and concrete—must be thought. The real progress is from a concrete vaguely apprehended to the same concrete more completely known and more exactly thought. True, the means is by a successive study of qualities and relations; but always as qualities and relations of the whole in question, not as independent existences. In a word knowledge is always of the concrete, for it is always of reality or a part of reality, and all reality is concrete. But the concrete is a system of relations, each of which may be separately attended to while explicit thought is abstracted from the rest. Thus, every abstract is a partial view of a concrete, and every concrete is a systematic whole in which it is possible to take

many such views." This exposition seems to us to be altogether admirable. But we are impelled to ask on what grounds that ideal union of the two points of view, which is desiderated, is held to be easier of attainment, when girls are taught entirely by women, and boys by men, than when boys and girls are taught together by both men and women. And, if we may define the limits of the answer, we should like it given with particular reference to the teaching of history.

The determination of the contributions made by the sexes respectively to the advancement of human knowledge is an entrancing theme, but not one upon which we should care to commit ourselves at any length. We cannot, however, look upon it as other than a vital question in the philosophy of education. And while we leave future workers in the educational field to deal with it in all its ramifications, we think it well to end this chapter with a reference to a thinker, whose conclusions on this subject, formulated above half-a-century ago, seem to us to be full both of historical insight and of prophetic wisdom ; and very relevant to the educational problems of to-day. In his discourse delivered at the Royal Institution in 1858, Henry Thomas Buckle analysed the " Influence of Women on the Progress of Knowledge." While he admitted the superiority of men in the production of works of supreme genius, he condemned the inference that women have no concern in the highest forms of knowledge, as false in theory and pernicious in practice. The influence of women he declared to be

" so great that it is hardly possible to assign limits to it." This influence he explained as largely due to the differing modes of apprehension of men and women. In what seems to us a more penetrating account of the matter than the simple distinction of masculine and feminine minds as interested in abstract and concrete respectively, he affirmed that women, while less given than men to following chains of reasoning (which are generally inductive in character), are more deductive in the manner of their thought. They start rather from the *idea* than the *fact*. On a lower plane they may be less infallible than men as reasoners; but what they lose of the rational or scientific is more than balanced for them by their hold upon the imaginative and spiritual.[1] And, after all, intuition is —as Plato long ago knew—the surest mode of apprehension—the only mode, indeed, in the region of highest truth. " I submit," said Buckle, " that there is a spiritual, a poetic and, for aught we know, a spontaneous and uncaused element in the human mind, which ever and anon, suddenly and without warning, gives us a glimpse and forecast of the future, and urges us to seize truth as it were by anticipation." Now it seems to us that all that Buckle said about the value of the characteristically feminine attitude of mind may be brought into connection with, and reinforced by, all that Nietzsche wrote upon the importance in history and culture of the sense of the

[1] " Reason is the enumeration of quantities already known; imagination is the perception of the value of those quantities, both separately and as a whole."—Shelley, " A Defence of Poetry."

"unhistorical," by the distinction too, which Mr Edmond Holmes has emphasised for us, between "information" and "knowledge" as ingredients in education,[1] and finally by Bergson's rehabilitation of the "instinctive" as equal participant with the "intelligent" in the advancing march of human knowledge.

Buckle notes how the refusal of the feminine mind to be bound by the limits of induction, "the scientific method," acts as a bulwark against the dangers of materialism which accompany too much science. The sphere of science is limited, and its progress is only rendered possible by the assumption of hypotheses. But the limitation makes science the more categorical within its sphere, and inclined to extend its sway beyond. While we recognise the lowering of the barrier between religion and science which has marked the advance of thought in modern times, we do not know that the dangers of materialism are less in our day than they were half-a-century ago. At any rate we have seen reason in another connection to believe that the preservation of culture in America is in no small part due to women's influence. And, whatever be our case, we cannot afford to do otherwise than make the best use of the genius of women. Through what channels that genius exerts itself, and how best we may come at it, may best be learned from the words of Buckle himself:

"From this point of view you will see the

[1] "What Is and What Might Be."

incalculable service women have rendered to the progress of knowledge. Great and exclusive as is our passion for induction, it would, but for them, have been greater and more exclusive still. . . . Their turn of thought, their habits of mind, their conversation, their influence, insensibly extending over the whole surface of society, and frequently penetrating its intimate structure, have, more than all other things put together, tended to raise us into an ideal world, lift us from the dust in which we are too prone to grovel, and develop in us those germs of imagination which even the most sluggish and apathetic understandings in some degree possess. The striking fact that most men of genius have had remarkable mothers, and that they have gained from their mothers far more than from their fathers ; this singular and unquestionable fact can, I think, be best explained by the principles which I have laid down. Some, indeed, will tell you that this depends upon laws of hereditary transmission. . . . I rather believe that in regard to the relation between men of genius and their mothers the really important events occur after birth, when the habits of thought peculiar to one sex act upon and improve the habits of thought peculiar to the other sex. . . . In after life other relations often arise by which the same process is continued. And, notwithstanding a few exceptions, we do undoubtedly find that the most truly eminent men have had not only their affections, but also their intellect, greatly influenced by women. . . . *Therefore it is that those, who are most anxious that the*

boundaries of knowledge should be enlarged, ought to be most eager that the influence of women should be increased, in order that every resource of the human mind may be at once and quickly brought into play.[1] . . . Before us and around us there is an immense and untrodden field, whose limits the eye vainly tries to define, so completely are they lost in the dim and shadowy outline of the future. In that field, which we and our posterity have yet to traverse, I firmly believe that the imagination will effect quite as much as the understanding. Our poetry will have to reinforce our logic, and we must feel as much as we must argue. *Let us then hope that the imaginative and emotional minds of one sex will continue to accelerate the great progress, by acting upon and improving the colder and harder minds of the other sex. By this coalition, by this union of different faculties, different tastes, and different methods, we shall go on our way with the greater ease.*[1] A vast and splendid career lies before us, which it will take many ages to complete. We see looming in the distance a rich and goodly harvest, into which perchance some of us may yet live to thrust the sickle, but of which, reap what we may, the greatest crop of all must be reserved for our posterity."

[1] Italics ours.

CHAPTER XI

POSITION AND PROSPECTS

"ὥσπερ γὰρ οἰκίας, οἶμαι, τὰ κάτωθεν ἰσχυρότατα εἶναι δεῖ, οὕτω καὶ τῶν πράξεων τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ὑποθέσεις ἀληθεῖς εἶναι προσήκει."—DEMOSTHENES, Olynth. II. 10.

> "Lay the first foundations deep,
> Lay them strongly, lay them true.
> There shall rise, when you shall sleep,
> Builders, building after you."

IT remains to give some consideration to the present position and prospects of Co-education in England. Paradoxically enough it is the wide extension of it in recent years which is giving its true advocates the greatest anxiety. For though we are prepared to affirm that there is no school anywhere in existence whose boys and girls would gain morally by separation, there is no doubt at all that there are hundreds of co-educational schools, secondary and elementary, existing under such wretched conditions that they may well seem to ignorant observers to be cogent illustrations of the dangers of the system. Consider what happens. A new secondary school for boys and girls is started in a district populous with the lower middle classes. To the pride of the neighbourhood and the delight of the local authority the school opens

with three or four hundred pupils. The expected number of these bring with them the vicious habit and conversation which they have acquired in segregated elementary schools. Though neither headmaster nor staff have had any experience of Co-education under proper conditions, though consequently none of the proper steps are taken, though no strong religious influence can be readily brought to bear, nor even anything resembling the *esprit de corps* of a boarding school, yet the wonderful influence of girlhood upon boyhood and of boyhood upon girlhood gets immediately to work and the vicious propensities are diminished perhaps in a single day by a third. So many boys find the old coarse conduct no longer possible to them. So many girls feel ashamed of the vulgar nonsense which has become their staple conversation. But there are many cases too far gone to yield easily to the purifying influence. The moral atmosphere is improved but still very far from perfect. Previously every kind of horror went on, unnoticed, unchecked. Now many eyes are on the watch and a few objectionable incidents are observed. This is very good for the morals of the children but very bad for the character of Co-education, to the account of which every such incident is immediately debited.

If Co-education were adopted solely by whole-hearted believers in its moral efficacy, by men who had gauged the extent of the immorality already existent and were determined to give a fair trial under fair conditions to the influence for good of one

sex upon the other, it would not take long to compel a general recognition of its beneficent power. But unhappily its adoption is usually due to a quite different reason—the assumption (which has, or should have, little or no basis of fact) that boys and girls can be more cheaply educated together than apart. Poor Co-education thus becomes the Cinderella of the schools. The well-to-do district prides itself upon the possession of separate schools and, as the parent struggles upwards in the battle of suburban life, he finds himself able to send his children to institutions which at least in one particular resemble Eton and Roedean. The cause has therefore little to hope from the multiplication of schools for both sexes by county and municipal authorities.

There are nevertheless compensations. For in the first place we have no doubt that the moral tone of the children is in fact in despite of all drawbacks materially improved. Secondly, a number of men and women on the staffs of these schools, more observant than their colleagues, will not fail to recognise that this is the case ; and so the cause will gain by degrees valuable adherents. Thirdly—and this is an advantage inherent in the co-educational system—the very fact, that, if anything objectionable takes place, it is far more likely to raise a scandal, will tend by degrees to awaken the public conscience from its disgraceful indifference to the moral temptations of childhood.

When success is claimed for some specific experiment in the Co-education of the sexes, opponents are wont to give an answer which is at first sight not a

little embarrassing to those who care more to defend co-educational principles than to sing the praises of a single institution. "We will admit," say they, "that satisfactory results are obtained at —— but we ascribe this wholly to the exceptional merits of one or two exceptional individuals. Co-education may succeed here and there, but it breaks down hopelessly in the hands of that very ordinary personage, the average headmaster." Now such an argument should open out a splendid opportunity for the alert advocates of our cause. For if it be meant that Co-education requires in its headmasters and headmistresses exceptional powers of discipline or of organisation, then all the facts stand up in refutation. But if the meaning be that a co-educational school will not prosper under a head who has no other qualification than a brilliant university degree, then we may retort that of all the tragedies, which have resulted from the segregation of the sexes into separate schools, none has been, none is, none could be so unpardonable, as the ignorance, carelessness and neglect which have led appointing bodies to suppose that scholastic attainments should be counted as anything in comparison with patient insight into child nature, proved love and sympathy for children and boundless care for their physical, mental and moral welfare. Of men and women with these qualities a supply—thank God—need never be lacking. If no other advantage were to result from the general adoption of Co-education than greater care and wisdom in the appointment of headmasters; this alone would go far to justify the change.

It is to be feared that the cause has also suffered to some extent from its association with fads, with which it has no sort of necessary connection. " Fad " is, we admit, a dangerous word in the mouth of an educational reformer. He may fairly be told that it indicates reforms for the appreciation of which he is insufficiently advanced. Nevertheless it seems to us permissible to emphasise the fact that Co-education is by no manner of means inconsistent with many things which parents have still a right to claim, if they so desire, including strict discipline, hard work, insistence on accuracy and other meritorious characteristics of the good schools of all times. As we have laid some stress upon the decisive changes in educational method, which we believe the future to have in store, and have insisted that Co-education has its natural place among these changes, it is perhaps not unimportant to dissociate ourselves with as much clearness as possible from certain misinterpretations, as they seem to us, of the lines of true reform. The chief of these lies in the use of the term " self-development." This term expresses fairly enough the fact (known to the first user of the verb " educate") that the powers which bring knowledge to the child reside in the child and not in his teacher. It has long been agreed theoretically that teaching is a matter of drawing out rather than of pumping in. And the new application of science to the problem of education is showing us that the old truism is yet truer than we had suspected. Few teachers have succeeded in confining their efforts to " drawing out " ; but

we know now that much even of the laborious effort to draw a certain daily quota from the child's mind has been against Nature and fruitless. Development must be *natural*, proceeding from the instinctive desire to practise powers and faculties,[1] which is the one source of all human (and animal) growth ; and the art of the educator consists in (*a*) encouraging, and (*b*) *guiding* this desire ; but, as the wish to guide must not lead us into the fatal error of checking the instinct instead of encouraging it, so the wish to encourage must not blind us to the necessity of guidance. It is here that an abuse of the term " self-development " is showing itself in England, which, in so far as it is associated with Co-education, is threatening grievous harm to the cause. It is a heresy which had appeared in print and in practice before the advent of Dr Montessori ; and its advocates have seized upon her book and misinterpreted it as confirming their views. It may be called the " run wild " heresy. It bids us leave the child to himself and content ourselves with admiring the result. It suffers from the old confusion of liberty with licence and, while bidding us trust Nature, forgets the summary way in which Nature warns off her children from dangerous places. We are forbidden to punish, as though Nature gave us no warrant—from the beneficent stomach-ache to the salutary pat administered by a wise mother to her kitten. If Co-education could only be had along with the theory of self-development run wild, not all our fervent belief

[1] See footnote, p. 15.

in the cause could prevent us from sympathising with parents who hesitated to expose their children to such a risk.

This is not the place for a full exposition of the true meaning of self-development under wise guidance. An authoritative volume upon the subject is badly needed, and we could wish that it might come from the pen of Dr Montessori herself. Meanwhile an instance may help to show how Nature may be retained, as the great educator, without sacrificing the advantages of a wholesome discipline. One of the chief means of learning with which Nature has dowered the child is the instinct of handling. Countless children grow up into stupid, stunted men and women because of the paralysing discouragement of "Don't touch" indefinitely repeated. Every effort must be made to utilise this beneficent handling instinct to the uttermost. In a Montessori school children are given easily portable tables with vases of flowers upon them in order that they may teach themselves by experience how to move furniture without damage. The result is that at the age of four years they display a grace and security of handling, which is so unusual as to impress one as miraculous. But there are other faculties in equal need of development, for which Nature has not forgotten to implant an instinct. There is the faculty of self-control. There is the faculty of the moral sense. Here then is the opportunity of the educator. "Touch by all means. Touching is an excellent game. But there is another good game which you will enjoy practising, and that

is learning not to touch things which are not yours or lent to you. The beauty of that game is that it gives you the opportunity of practising two excellent faculties, the faculties of honesty and of self-control." And suppose that the handling instinct triumphs at first over the instinct of self-control. Well! there is another instinct to which one may appeal, the instinct of obedience. And if the handling instinct is still too strong? Then let us inquire of Dame Nature what would be her procedure under the circumstances. "Bless me," she will say, "what a simple matter! Administer a small dose of pain and have done with it." Montessori experience proves (what indeed many good mothers must have known before) how much the child delights in watching the growth of this power of control over himself and how the game of self-discipline, if learnt early enough, does in fact almost entirely obviate the need of punishment. But should punishment be necessary, well! as Nature knows, it *is* necessary. Those who argue otherwise are as one who should affirm that, because vaccination, successfully applied in infancy, prevents small-pox, therefore if small-pox break out we must confine ourselves to vaccination as a remedy. There is visible (in such an effort for example as the Duty and Discipline Movement) a wholesome reaction against running wild in the home or in the school. But it may of course quite easily develop heresies of its own. It will be the duty of prudent Co-educators to make it plain that they are sincere in their determination to call in the help of Nature, even to the

extent, if necessary, of imitating with due discretion Nature's timely, time-honoured and downright methods.

From other heresies of the extremists we have, it is hoped, sufficiently guarded ourselves in the foregoing chapters. Such are the tendency to deny or ignore all sex differences and the endeavour to make girls as close an imitation of boys as possible. If it seem irrelevant to add here a few words upon religious training, we must excuse it on the ground that nearly all the attacks upon Co-education which reach us have in fact nothing to do with the essentials of the co-educational creed, but fall foul of some custom found somewhere in operation in a school for boys and girls. It has to be realised that, when the parent has made up his (or, more probably, her) mind that Co-education involves less risk than the separate system, there still remains the duty of discovering the particular school which attempts to carry into practice such other principles as the parent in question believes to be right and true. We believe, for example, that Co-education is favourable to reverence and respect for the opinions of others ; but if there are parents who consider these qualities old-fashioned or obsolete, we are not prepared to say that no school for both sexes is to be found which can give them what they desire.

But, in regard to religious training, we are bound to express our opinion that all the arguments from Nature and from the new science, which we have used in support of Co-education, point also to the necessity

of bringing to the aid of the child's spiritual nature all the sanction and appeal of revealed religion. As long as education in compartments was supposed to be a reasonable method, as long as no necessary connection was felt even between two intellectual subjects, and we were still farther from imagining that physical and moral overlapped mental education, as well as one another, so long there was perhaps some excuse for such a theory as that religious teaching should be left to the parents. But when it is seen that the education of each child is a single and indivisible effort to encourage and not at any point to thwart the harmonious development of his whole being, it becomes at once patently absurd to suppose that so vital a factor as the religious sanction can for a single day be ignored. Let us take an elementary instance of our meaning, remembering that the child mind is a sacred thing, the natural growth of which is to be observed with reverent attention and never to be discouraged or thwarted or checked by unnecessary contradictions or confusions. The child then, seeking to practise his faculties, comes inevitably up against many things which he must not do. Often there is no such natural warning as in the case (for example) of playing with fire. The faculty of obedience has to be called in aid. But the law of obedience requires a sanction, for the child must learn to obey some and not others. Now every student of child nature knows that the religious parent can and does very early in the life history of the child fall back upon the appeal to the will of God. Herein in future lies for him the

criterion between right and wrong. And henceforth whoever is for the moment responsible for that child must be prepared to fall back upon the same court of appeal. They are indeed ignorant of the subtle simplicity of child nature who suppose that any faltering or paltering here will not bring with it that sense of confusion or contradiction which deals so grievous a blow to harmonious continuity of development. But with regard to religion *quot homines tot sententiae*. What then is to be done ? That is indeed the most anxious of all problems. For the present parents must seek out those teachers whose appeal is to that sanction upon which they desire their child's character to be built up. But the day is coming when *the child will compel us all to the same foundations of belief*. On no other terms can the advance of humanity be carried far. It would be as reasonable, nay ! far more reasonable, to expect a successful mental training, if each teacher were to employ a different word for the same thing. We live in a difficult age at the turning of the ways ; but not a few agencies are at work for the simplification of life, of thought and of belief. Is it merely the fondness of fanaticism, finding in a single cause alleviation of all the ills of humanity? Or may we not perhaps be justified in thinking that, with the ceasing of the anomalous divorce of one sex from another at an age when all the unities and harmonies should be working together to create the complete character, there will cease also that strangest of all anomalies, disagreement as to the fundamental instincts and intuitions of the race, as to whether

the Spirit of the Universe gives to the spirit of man truth or falsehood or simply no word or sign ?

We who believe in Co-education, in what form are we to hope that success should come to the cause ? That is a question which those who are working for a cause are perhaps sometimes not careful enough to answer. In the unhappy history of religious divisions there are recorded many instances of men who have gone out into the wilderness for a cause which has appeared to them to demand their lives and, if need be, their deaths. They have recruited followers, ten thousand, a hundred thousand, or maybe more ; and after their death the sect has lived on, more or less holding its own. Is this to be reckoned success ? Not surely, if in these bare figures is summed up the whole achievement. If the cause was in fact as urgent, the truth at stake as vital, as the founder believed, then to have stopped short at a hundred thousand, at a million even, is to have failed indeed. If, on the other hand, the issues were really of less intrinsic and lasting importance than in the first heat of controversy they appeared, surely the whole effort was an error, the schism a calamity if not a crime. There is, we submit, an alternative. It may be that the vital truth which the founder saw to be at stake, forced by his protest into the slow minds and consciences of men, has spread far beyond the bounds of the sect which championed it, and become at last the secure heritage

of the race. The sect lives on, though all reason for its separate existence has passed away. It were better reunited to the parent stem. But the founder has scored a success, compared with which the multiplication of his sect an hundred-fold would have been a matter of insignificance. For Co-educators the moral is to care more for the victory of the great truths upon which their cause is firm based, than for the number of co-educational schools.

That the false directions taken by human evolution are answerable for the educational stagnation of many weary centuries; that the artificialities, insincerities, false conventions of the age act upon the child, as poisonous fumes, drugging brain and soul; that the return to Nature can be achieved only by science, by scientific observation of child body, child mind, child soul, by laborious, self-denying rooting out from our daily life and conversation of all that makes for confusion or contradiction of thought; that without moral security intellectual brilliance is but a useless and dangerous toy; above all, that it is the individual who matters, and not the school or the community; that the individual can and at all costs must be saved, built up into complete, secure, efficient manhood or womanhood; that there must be an end to the monstrously unnatural recklessness of parents, sending forth their children to "sink or swim"; that there must be an end to the fatalistic acquiescence of teachers daring to suppose that a certain percentage of children are "born stupid," that a farther percentage are bound to go to the bad

—these are the great truths which, let us not forget it, have made us co-educationalists; it is upon the triumph of these, rather than upon the number of schools for boys and girls, that hangs the true victory of our cause.

How men—even parents—came to lose sight of the sacredness of the individual life, to risk children in herds and battalions, as we gamble with soldiers' lives on a battlefield, is a wonder beyond explanation. There are signs—thank God—that the mothers at least are rising in revolt. But it may well be that in the search for remedies other long overdue reforms will precede the adoption of our own specific. Numbers will be reduced, the unpardonably dangerous break between Preparatory and Public School abolished, teachers will be chosen more especially for their pastoral qualifications, religion will be less a matter of formal repetitions in the chapel and more a vital quickening force, pervading all hours of the school life. Such reforms may seem to delay the general adoption of Co-education. But if it be based, as we hold, on elemental truth, the delay will be probably more apparent than real and need in no case trouble us. *Magna est veritas et prævalet.* What is essential is not that co-educational schools should be many, but that they should be good. There will be amongst us different ideas of goodness, of method, even of principle. Very well. There need be—and *must be*—no compromise. We must have different schools and think it unnecessary to pretend that our differences do not matter. But we must all alike work

consciously, unremittingly at the problem of scientific education. With the advent of Dr Montessori the time has passed for any clinging to the doctrine of *solvitur ambulando*. The reign of empiricism is over. We cannot all study physiology or even psychology (though it is to be hoped that the teachers of the future will tend more and more to do so), but we all can and must strive to keep abreast with the discoveries of Dr Montessori and her fellow-workers.

Yet here a grave caution must be entered. No theory, however stoutly held, must be allowed to imperil the safety of the individual. There is, we may be sure, little danger of this so long as our theories are founded on scientific truth. But it has been too characteristic of the theorists in our own country in recent years to insist upon applying their theory in every case in spite of what they would describe as "certain interesting exceptions, where difficulties of environment hindered the success of the experiment." Failure may be instructive in horticultural experiments, but with our children *we must not fail*. Before the urgent need of saving the individual child theories must be sacrificed as often as it may seem necessary. It is no more unpardonable to fiddle while Rome burns, than to see a boy heading for ruin before your very eyes, yet be unable to overcome your prejudice against testing the efficacy of corporal punishment. Scientific education is still in its infancy. We know enough to believe that, if right methods be employed, no case is hopeless ; but we do not know (*a*) how far individuals may require treatment differing

from that normally right, (*b*) how far past or present environment may render the individual incapable of profiting by the normally right treatment. Sympathetic insight and a patient employment of expedients must be brought in to correct in such cases general scientific conclusions—with the effectual belief that it is against the will of the Father that one of these little ones should fail.

Co-education has many friends in this country, but can hardly be said hitherto to have had many supporters. It is in sore need of them. Victories are not won by a measure, however considerable, of friendly approval. The causes which have triumphed have cost much to many people in effort and sacrifice, have brought many together, animated by one controlling purpose. Those who are in the midst of the battle know how much help is coming to the cause from the handful of workers who are really devoting to it their time and their strength. Were it not an infringement of the rule of abstinence, which we have adopted for reasons which will be understood and appreciated, it would have been pleasant indeed to have mentioned them here by name. We should be glad to have reason to think that this statement of the case for Co-education was succeeding in turning a few waverers into friends and constraining a few enemies to waver ; but we should welcome with yet more delight evidence that it was convincing many, already favourably disposed, that the time and opportunity had come for more definitely active support. To support a cause efficiently one needs to know

the principles upon which it rests, the arguments in its favour, the answer to common objections; one needs, especially in the case which we are pleading, to be able to show that what are alleged to be unsatisfactory results of the system are not in fact inherent in the principles, but due to readily removable errors in the attempt to carry it out. And we must repeat that at this time of almost bewilderingly rapid advance—amongst the few at least, if not yet amongst the many—in the grasp of true educational principles supporters of Co-education must strive to keep abreast with that advance, to realise and to help others to realise that the future is with them, to believe that, because it is itself in the direct line of true progress and will—more than any other reform—compel the world to see and accept the path of progress, Co-education is a cause worthy of all the enthusiasm, effort and self-sacrifice of those to whom childhood and its possibilities are a wonder and an inspiration.

APPENDIX A

"MANCHE rathen sogar, das Kind soll sich schämen lernen, sich selber zu sehen; sich selber?—Himmel, mit welchen giftigen Nebenbegriffen müsste die junge Gestalt sich schon beschauen, damit sie vor sich selber—etwas anders ist's vor andern—über das Unveränderliche und Unwillkürliche erröthete, d. h. über den Schöpfer desselben!—Auch in späten Jahren sind knaben unter sich allein, oder Mädchen unter sich, fast unverschämt; nur die Geschlechter gegen einander sind verschämt, ja dasselbe Geschlecht gegen das erwachsene. Doch geht hieraus für die geistige Stufenzeit des zwölften oder fünfzehnten Jahres voll Revoluzion und Evoluzion die Regel hervor: mischt die Geschlechter, um sie aufzuheben; denn zwei Knaben werden zwölf Mädchen, oder zwei Mädchen werden zwölf Knaben recht gut gegen alle Winke, Reden und Unschicklichkeiten gerade durch die Vorlaufende Morgenröthe des erwachenden Triebes, durch die Schamröthe, beschirmen und beschränken. Hingegen eine Mädchenschule ganz allein beisammen, oder so eine Knabenschule—ich stehe für nichts. Doch schaden Knaben Knaben mehr, als Mädchen Mädchen; denn jene sind keeker, offner, zutraulicher, roher, wissenschaftlicher, in Sachen wissluftiger, so wie diese in Personen, etc." —RICHTER, "Levana," § 129.

APPENDIX B

We are very glad to print the following observations from the pen of a lady whose experience has afforded her ample opportunity for the comparative study of Co-education and the "separate" system. Owing to a mistake for which we alone are responsible, it has been impossible to include this "evidence" in the text of the book—a course we should have preferred to follow. For we are fully sensible that, in view of the character of our subject, the undiluted masculinity which marks the authorship of this book is far from constituting a merit :—

During the last thirty years or so we have seen a complete change come about, of necessity, in girls' education. The former ideal was the acquiring of a certain amount of useful knowledge and general culture ; now, a girl aims at preparing for a career, and, more often than not, earning her own living.

More important, and perhaps more far-reaching, is the change that has handed over the educating of girls and their training to women teachers. Is it not remarkable that an age that expects girls to take their place in life on an equal footing with their brothers has at the same time gone back to the old convent idea of educating them apart from all masculine influence and society ? It is also to be noted

that a generation of young women has now grown up educated completely under feminine influence in school and college, and by women who themselves were trained by women. The education of girls is now completely in the hands of women of the second and third generation which has come very little under masculine influences. This is worth careful consideration, for it must bring about certain results.

The great ability and the many fine qualities of the modern schoolmistress have won her so strong a position in our national life that it is not needful for me to praise her here ; but I should like to point out that these very qualities make it possible and very desirable that she should take her place alongside of men, and play her part in the education of boys as well as of girls.

In a modern school for girls the masculine element is more strictly excluded than is the feminine in schools for boys. Women doctors, gardeners, games mistresses and riding mistresses are very usually found. The Head is unmarried. The servants are all women. So it comes about that when a boy or a man appears within the precincts curiosity is aroused and questions are asked. Distrust of men did not bring about this state of affairs in girls' schools and colleges ; rather this state of affairs is bringing about in these institutions a great distrust of all things masculine.

In a school famous for its broad views and its fine discipline, when girls asked, as was very natural, if their brothers or other boy friends could see over the

school they were very justly proud of, or watch the games they excelled in, or come to concerts or school dances, they were told " only if under fourteen or married." This formula was treated as a standing jest throughout the school. Surely it was utterly wrong to teach girls that from fourteen until marriage boys and men were unsuitable companions for them. This is purely " Oriental " teaching.

Thanks to outdoor sports and simple living, with strict and wise discipline, our girls grow up as a rule robust and vigorous in mind and body. Yet I have observed, during many years spent amongst women students of many nationalities, that those who have been educated at home and have grown up with their fathers and brothers, as is the case in most continental countries, and those who have had the advantage of Co-education, as in America and in Scandinavia, are more at home, as it were, in the world, and approach life with a broad common-sense that is often lacking in our English girls, who are more easily carried away by " theories " of life, which want of experience of the reality of things prevents their taking at a true value.

I have also noted a tendency in young women educated in English schools and colleges to be timid and even morbid in their relation to men. They are too apt to rely rather on information taken from books than the ordinary experiences of life. Unfortunately too many of the most popular writers of the day have not a very high ideal to offer young girls. In a community of unmarried women the

atmosphere is apt to become somewhat rarefied, developing an over-refined culture and over-sensitive feelings. Little sins are dwelt upon that, once rebuked, should be quickly forgotten. Feelings are too seriously considered. In modern schools, where there are plenty of interests to absorb even the most sentimental of girls, it does not often happen that talk about flirtations and correspondence with boys takes place; yet such things do occur and very naturally. The experienced mother of boys and girls snubs her daughter on such occasions and the matter is forgotten; but the schoolmistress, whose education has inclined her to shrink from such things, makes too often a serious fault out of a little folly. For such childish misdemeanours girls are treated as bad and frivolous characters. But their more correct and priggish companions perhaps get more harm from being taught to dwell on their own superior virtue.

Character cannot develop to the full in an atmosphere that is too sympathetic. Women understand girls only too well and therefore meet their difficulties half-way, and are over-ready to help to overcome them. Because they understand they make allowance; what is very serious they treat with careless indifference. They cannot give what they themselves lack. The stiffer fibre of the masculine mind and its lesser impressionability brace and train a girl's mental powers. New channels of thought are opened to her, and she discovers that there is another outlook upon life than that peculiar to her own sex. In this way she learns her level. When we consider how much in

ordinary conventional homes and schools boys and girls, men and women, are trained to follow separate paths through life, can we wonder when we see many able women carried away by a bitter spirit of rivalry and jealousy, and an inability to be just to those with whom they should be working hand in hand in the great struggle against evil, ignorance and folly?

There is surely some great misunderstanding abroad which should be rectified. Never in the history of the world has there been a better opportunity than to-day for men and women to work in partnership for the good of the race. To bring this about, the first step is to train them and educate them together, brothers and sisters, boys and girls, men and women. Let there be no dangerous years when, kept apart, they learn to distrust each other, to think with contempt and with harsh judgment of each other's feelings and weaknesses: rather through disciplined intercourse let them learn to know one another, and let us believe and trust that with a truer understanding come mutual sympathy, respect and confidence.

Outside the home circle and the home influence, surely Co-education offers the best means—perhaps even a fuller and better means than the home—of bringing this about.

SUSAN SCOTT MONCRIEFF.

13 PARK TERRACE,
OXFORD.

APPENDIX C

A NOTE ON DAY SCHOOLS

Do not the arguments against segregation, as we have stated them, lose something of their force in the case of day schools ? We are well aware that some of our readers will ask this question. Nevertheless we have decided deliberately against the attempt to deal point by point with the Case for Co-education in the day school. For it is the boarding school which we have set out to capture. To a large majority of those whom we seek to convince the boarding school represents England's settled policy, determined not alone by tradition and tendency but by force of circumstance. Admitting exceptions, we feel it to be true in the main that those Englishmen who can afford to do so, prefer either to entrust their children to boarding schools or to live where they can send them to schools (such as Clifton) of which the full boarders are the mainstay.

Those who choose a day school in the belief (which we do not share without many qualifications) that it involves less moral risk, are already so far on the way to Co-education that they do not seem to us to require "separate treatment." Only let them remember that moral evil is highly infectious and

that the source of infection escapes notice in a day school more easily than in a boarding school.

There remain the big city day schools, which attract by the frequent excellence of their headmasters or headmistresses and by the number of their scholastic successes, which nevertheless the logic of events must—as we believe—abolish or profoundly modify ; and the schools which cater for those who, having chosen a desirable residence, send their children to the nearest teaching establishment. Of these last we must be content to say that, though we believe that *all* schools must gain by the admission of both sexes, it is not in them that we desire the main trial of Co-education to take place.

INDEX

A

ABSTRACT and concrete, 274, 289-290
Aim of education, 9-12
American Co-education, and boys, 161, 170-173, 176, 179-180, 188-192, 194, 197; comparison with English conditions, 196-200; and democracy, 160; and discipline, 196-199, 209; extent of, 161-162; and feminisation, 170-176, 187, 190-191, 194; and girls, 160, 161, 162, 164, 167-168, 170-173, 179-180, 184-185, 187-190; and marriage, 164, 186, 192, 193; and position of women, 162, 164-165; reaction against, 177-183; and relation between the sexes, 163-164; and sex strain, 166, 194. *See* also Boston, Hall, Mosely Commission
Andrewes, Cyril Bruyn, 203
Arnold, 58-66
Art, 287
Astelle, Mary, 119

B

BEARD, 168
Benson, A. C., 31, 41-42
Biology and sex differences, 138 *et seq.*, 184, 262
Blackwood's Magazine, 31, 32, 47, 48
Boissier, 89 *n.*, 92
Boston, School Committee, 166 *et seq.*
Boy, the, and Co-education: discipline, 207-209; "emotional" education, 218-220; games, 209-211; girls' influence on general development, 235; on ethical code, 231-233; on religion, 233-235; on sex morality, 220-226; limited segregation, 253-254, 266-267; women teachers, 170, 172, 197, 200, 208-209, 249-252. *See* also America, Co-education, Differences, Girl, Public School.
Bryant, Miss, 265
Bryce, James, 163, 164
Buckle, Henry Thomas, 290-294
Burgerstein, 267
Burgon, 111 *n.*
Burness, G. F., 279-284
Burstall, Miss, 172, 179
Burt, Mr, 273 *n.*
Butler, Samuel, 55, 144 *n.*, 152

C

CHESTERFIELD, Lord, 123
Chivalry, educational system of, 103-107; and women, 101-103
Christianity, and monastic ideals, 95-100; and schools, 94-95; and women, 93-94
Cleveland High School, 181
Clouston, Dr, 263
Comparé, 159, 175, 176, 185 *n.*
Clarke, Dr, 166-168

Co-education, absence in early times, 79; claims of, 23, 26-27, 245-247; and convention, 243-244; and co-operation between boys and girls, 245-247; and dancing, 247; and differences between boys and girls, mental, 143, 173-176, 189, 255-256, 272-294; and differences between boys and girls, physical, 267-272; and differences between boys and girls, vocational, 181, 261-267; and discipline, 196-199, 208-209; and games, 209; and humour, 236; and manners, 247-248, 257-258; and morality, 25-26, 76-77, 146-150, 163, 191, 203, 220-227, 296; and new methods, 22, 299-306; and prefectorial system, 199, 245; and Public School, 24, 53-54, 77, 207; and religion, 232-235; Roman, 89, 93; and segregation, 253, 263-267; and sex strain, 166, 194, 218-226; and social reform, 53, 76, 128-129, 146, 248-249; and teaching qualifications, 298. *See* also America, Boy, Girl, Hall, Tayler, Welton

D

Daily Graphic, 44, 259
Dancing, 247
Davis, Professor, 277
Day schools, 318
Defoe, 124
Differences between the sexes, mental, 143, 173-176, 189, 255-256, 272-294; physical, 267-272; vocational, 181, 261-267
Discipline, 189, 196, 207, 251
Drane, Mrs, 94 *n.*, 98 *n.*, 99, 106-107
Dukes, Dr Clement, 50

E

Economics and Woman's Movement, 133-134, 150-151
Edinburgh Review, 29, 125
Ellis, Havelock, 130, 134, 154, 186 *n.*
Elyot, Sir Thomas, 201, 249
Englewood High School, 178-180
English, teaching of, 283-285
Erasmus, 116
Evolution and sex differences, 138-140, 143, 145, 184

F

Family, and Public School, 33, 39, 42-44, 48-49, 71; as school, Hebrew, 83; Roman, 88; early Christian, 94; Chivalric, 104-107; Humanistic, 114; Reformation, 115-117; Tudor, 120; Puritan, 118; Stuart, 120-121; eighteenth century, 124; and social order, 78
Feminism. *See* Woman's Movement.
Feminisation. *See* America.
Francis, Alexander, 196 *n.*
Freeman, Kenneth, 86 *n.*
Friendship, between boy and girl, 242, 244
Froebel, 19

G

Games, 57, 209
Georgian, The, 53
Girl, the, under Co-education, 150-155, 211-218, 226-230, 252-258. *See* also America, Boy, Differences, Marriage; education of, Hebrew, 84; Greek, 87; Roman, 89 *n.*, 92; Chivalric, 104, 105, 107; Humanistic, 114; Reforma-

Girl, the—*continued*
tion, 115, 117; at St Cyr, 120; in eighteenth century, 122-125; and relation to other sex, 150-154, 313-317; varying ideals of, 144-145
Godwin, William, 125
Gray, Dr, 49, 190, 194
Gregson, 280
Guilds, 108-110.

H

Hagman, Mlle., 269
Hall, Professor Stanley, 78-79, 152, 166-167, 170, 173, 176, 177, 184 *et seq.*
Hallam, 102 *n.*
Harpenden, 23
Harris, Dr W. T., 166
Hawtrey, Miss Mabel, 250, 264
Hereford, Bishop of, 48-49
Hibbert Journal, 183
Hill, Miss G., 100
History, teaching of, 284-286
Hodgson, Miss G., 95
Home. *See* Family.
Hort, Sir Arthur, 42
Humour, 236
Hunt, Leigh, 52 *n.*, 59 *n.*

I

Individual, importance of the, 17, 47, 67-68, 75-76, 308
Industrial Revolution, 109-110, 124, 151

J

Jonson, Ben, 121

K

Keswick, 23

L

Languages, teaching of, 282
Leach, Mr, 100, 106, 108 *n.*
Lean, Mrs Bevan, 270
Livy, and Co-education, 89 *n.*
Local Authorities, and Co-education, 295-296
Locke, John, 121
Lotze, 78
Luther, 115
Lyttelton, 43, 51

M

Maintenon, Mme. de, 120
Marriage and Co-education, 164, 186, 192-193, 239, 240-242
Mathematics, teaching of, 279-281
Martial and Co-education, 89 *n.*
Meiners, 153 *n.*, 157
Melville, Miss Francis, 262
Mill, J. S., 134
Milton, 286
Monasticism. *See* Christianity, and Public School.
Montagu, Lady Stuart, 123
Montessori, Dr, 17, 20-21, 79, 300, 302
Mosely Commission, 49, 170, 171, 182
Münsterberg, Professor, 173-174
Music, 286
Musonius and Co-education, 93*n.*

N

Nature and education, 14-17, 21-23, 300-303, 306. *See* also Evolution.
Nineteenth Century, 45
Nobility, education of, 99, 104 *et seq.*, 111

P

PALMGREN, Mme., 268
Paton, Mr, 50, 204
Pearson, Karl, 153 *n.*
Pellatt, Mr, 30-34, 37, 39-41
Pestalozzi, 9, 19, 20, 21
Philbrick, Dr, 168
Poirson, S., 269
Ponsonby, A., 106 *n.*, 121
Prefectorial system, 59, 199, 245
Prostitution, 51, 52, 134, 137
Public School, changes in character of, 59-60, 74-75; characteristic features of, 57; and Co-education, 24, 53-54, 77; compared with American school, 194, 197 *et seq*, 209; compared with Continental school, 32, 33; and education of emotions, 219-220; and immorality, 25-26, 38-53 *passim*. its own critic, Chapter I. merits of, 24, 55-56; monastic character of, 42, 43, 44, 96, 100, 110, 203, 205; origins of, 96, 100, 110; spirit, 206 *et seq*. and "tyranny of the norm," 29-30, 204-205

Q

Quarterly Review, 57-58
Quintilian, 90

R

REACTION against co-education. *See* America.
Reddie, Cecil, 183
Religion in school, 232-235, 303-306
Renaissance, 113 *et seq*.
Results of education, 17-21
Rhys, Miss Isabel, 187 *n*.
Richter, 231, 312
Ruskin, 277

S

SCHOOLS, boarding *v*. day, 318; Hebrew, 83-84; Greek, 87; Roman, 89-93; early Christian, 94-95; "monastic," 99; chivalric, 103-107; guild, 108; burgher, 110; church, 110-111; chantry, 110 *n*.; court, 114-115; Renaissance and Reformation, 115-118; eighteenth century, 122-126. *See* also Public School.
Science, teaching of, 281,
Scientific education, 13-14, 19-23, 202-203, 299-303
Scott Moncrieff, Miss S., 313-317
Self-development, 15, 299-303
Sentimental Attraction, 238-240
Sex differences, *see* Differences; distinction and equality, 132-136 and Chapter V. *passim*.; in education, 146-155; morality, *see* Co-education and Public School; relations and society, 80, 145-146; relations in America, 163-164; relations at universities, 243; segregation, 177-183, 253, 263-267; strain, 166, 194, 218
Sheavyn, Miss Phoebe, 263
Skrine, Canon, 53-54, 68, 71
Smith, Sidney, 125, 130
Stanley, Dean, 59, 60
St George's School, 23
St Palaye, 95 *n*., 103, 105

T

TACITUS, 90
Tayler, L., 138-143
Thomas, Miss C., 268
Thomson, Professor, J. A., 262
Thring, 66-73
Times, The, 50

V

Vittorino da Feltre, 114
Vocational training, 181, 261-267

W

Wallace, A. R., 153 *n.*
Webb, Mrs, 85 *n.*
Welldon, Dean, 44, 259
Welton, Professor, 251 *n.*, 274-276, 288-290
White, Dr E. E., 166
Whetham, Mr and Mrs, 263
Wilson, Archdeacon, 97 *n.*
Wollstonecraft, Mary, 124-125, 131-133, 155-158
Woman's Movement, Chapter V. abstract philosophy of, 130; beginnings of, 119; and competition, 135-137; and economic factor, 133-135, 144; and education, 146-155
Women, Hebrew, 83; in Greece, 86-88; in Rome, 88, 92; and the Church, 94, 96-98, 113; and chivalry, 102-103; and guilds, 109-110; in Middle Ages, 112, 117; and Humanism, 113-114; and Reformation, 117 *et seq.*; in eighteenth century, 122; and culture, 152, 171; and social morals, 80, 222, 226; and emotionalism, 254-256; Thring's views of, 69-71, 73
Women teachers and boys, 170, 172, 197, 200, 208-209, 249-252; and girls, 229, 254-255, 269-271. *See* also America, Co-education, Differences, Girl, Hall, Tayler, Welton
Woods, Miss Alice, 188
Woodward, 114, 115, 116
Wotton, 119

Z

Ziegler, 192

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

LC
1601
G76

Grant, Cecil
The case for co-education